

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1404177



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA





The Church Historical Society.

President :—THE RIGHT REVEREND M. CREIGHTON, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

Chairman :—THE REVEREND W. E. COLLINS,
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
AT KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

XLIV.

Lancelot Andrewes

A REPRESENTATIVE OF ANGLICAN PRINCIPLES.

*A Lecture delivered at Holy Trinity, Chelsea,
February 28, 1897.*

BY THE REV.

WALTER HOWARD FRERE,

OF THE COMMUNITY OF THE RESURRECTION, MIFFIELD.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.

NEW YORK: E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.

1898

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

BISHOP

LANCELOT ANDREWES.



THE life of Bishop Lancelot Andrewes is chiefly valuable as being the best early witness of the working out of the principles of the English Reformation in Religion. In itself it was very uneventful, and the facts which it is necessary to bear in mind in considering it are remarkably few. It is the man himself who arrests our attention, not his doings. He was distinguished from many points of view; we may see in him the great preacher, the unrivalled scholar, the strong defender of the Church, the pure-souled prelate as the Court of Elizabeth or James knew him, the saintly penitent as in his closet he laid bare his heart to God; but it is not the sermons, nor the scholarship, nor the controversy, nor the blameless reputation, nor even the matchless prayers,

which interests the student of his life, but always the man himself, who shines out through them all. It may be said that this is true of every biography; but it is true of Andrewes in an exceptional degree. Take, for example, the work by which he is best known. His *Sermons* are mines of acute scholarship and profound theology: but we feel that we read them not for the sake of the scholarship, nor of the theology, but for the sake of the writer. Every fresh sentence reveals a character large and lofty, pure in heart and motive, but before all things penitent. Even the subtlety and comprehensiveness of his intellect claims our wonder, not so much for itself, but as being part of a much larger thing.

Just as in a magnificent building, while the parts severally each impress the spectator with a sense of size and massiveness, the whole impresses him mainly with a sense of such exquisite proportion and balance that he can hardly conceive of it being other than it is: so in the case of Andrewes, while the several parts raise our wonder and surprise, the whole seems entirely natural and simple, as if it could hardly have been different from what it was.

This life and character we may proudly claim as the rich firstfruits of the working out of the principles of the Reformation. Our main object in this lecture is to justify this view of the subject, and so to try and set the good bishop in his position in the list of English typical Churchmen.

But before doing so it will be convenient to summarize the main events of the life, choosing out and noting the one or two points and dates which must be borne in mind as landmarks and guides.

Lancelot Andrewes was born in 1555, and died in 1626: his life therefore is, roughly speaking, coincident with the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I.

London was one of the main scenes of his career, for here he was born and received his earliest education: here he spent much of his later life, at St. Paul's as Canon; at St. Giles', Cripplegate, as Vicar; at Westminster as Dean; at Court, or at his episcopal palace in Southwark; and at the latter place he died.

Cambridge claims a large share of his life also; for he was at Pembroke College for eighteen years as Student and Fellow (1571-1589) and for sixteen years as Master of the College. During the earlier part of the time

he was mainly in residence, and his influence in the University was very considerable.

For the last twenty-one years of his life he was bishop, first of Chichester, then of Ely, and finally of Winchester. He would have been bishop earlier if he would have given in to Elizabeth's usual conditions of promotion and alienated the property of the see; but this he entirely refused to do, and so his appointment was deferred till James' reign.

There is little enough to record, considering that he was one of the chief figures of the day. Happy the life that has no history!

We can now take up our main theme and work it out; we have to show in what sense Andrewes can be said to be the firstfruits of the working out of the principles of the English Reformation of Religion.

The great upheaval, which affected the religious world all over Europe in the first half of the sixteenth century, found us in England very much inclined towards some active movement. There was a deep feeling of political discontent with the papacy, as a corrupting and extortionate influence; this came to join hands with a deeper and more really religious feeling of discontent with the

corruptions of religion prevalent both in doctrine and in practice. These corruptions were widespread and a well-known grievance, but they had hitherto defied all attempts at reform. The result of the combination was a ferment which at one time, under the weak rule of Edward VI's council, threatened to imperil the principles of the Christian Church in our land.

In the midst of the confusion the leaders of the English Church seized and clung to three guiding principles, which saved her from the ruin which involved not only the Continental Reformers but the sister Church of Scotland. These principles were (1) the appeal to the Bible as the test of essential doctrine, (2) the appeal to antiquity and Catholic tradition, (3) the authority of the Church as arbiter in matters of faith and mistress in matters of discipline.

These principles, though clear enough both in earlier times and since, were then seized somewhat blindly, as was natural in the midst of a great upheaval; men did not at the moment fully realize what they involved; many a reformer felt himself as it were in the position of a drowning man who instinctively seizes a rope, and holds on to it,

without knowing what there is at the other end of it, but hoping for the best. But they have come to justify the confidence which was reposed in them. The act of deep-seated faith in Catholic principles, thus made by the English Church, is in strong contrast with what was done elsewhere by those who laboured at a reformation.

They found soon enough that it was far easier to be revolutionary than to be constitutional. To reconstruct on the old lines was slow and tedious ; it was far more attractive to unfold a brand-new system of theology and church government, resplendent in its freshness and commanding in its completeness. So Genevan Calvinism or Scotch Presbyterianism could not fail to win numbers of adherents, who felt the need of a rest for the sole of their feet, and were in a hurry to take up any new position which seemed to promise some solidity. Then, from their hastily adopted standpoint, they turned to exhort or mock the English Church, because she was content still to struggle with catholic principles. "She would please nobody: she had broken with the Papist, but still had too much of the dregs of prelacy and popery about her to please the reformers: she is

trying to take up an utterly anomalous and illogical position: she had much better give it up and throw in her lot with revolutionary protestantism."

But the Englishman is profoundly constitutional: he spells revolution without the r. He does not on the whole mind tolerating an anomalous and illogical position if meanwhile he can be looking round to see how to work his way out of it. The working out of the English Reformation of Religion exemplifies these characteristics just as much as the gradual working out of the British Constitution. The method is the same in each: a rapid grasp of one or two leading principles, and then the slow-moving evolution of the rest.

At the Reformation, when the principle was grasped of appeal to the Bible and to antiquity, coupled with deference to Church authority, it became at once a sort of touchstone by which the existing doctrines and practices were to be tried. At the very outset this method secured for the English Church a large essential nucleus both of doctrine and of government which elsewhere, in the whirl of reform, was liable to be sacrificed, even if it had not already been given up. The

three creeds, the two gospel Sacraments, the threefold apostolic ministry, the authority of the first four general Councils—the continuance of such things as these never was in question, since they obviously and at once satisfied the test, and were seen to be in accordance with the principles—i. e. to be both biblical and primitive. And so throughout with the central doctrines of religion.

But with regard to beliefs less central and vital the case was different. It could not be seen at once how such beliefs would agree with the principles: the testing of them was bound to take time, and much had to be left to be worked out gradually. Moreover the secondary doctrines were much more corrupted than the central doctrines, and therefore the testing of them was doubly difficult: partly because past corruptions made it hard to take a judicial view and be fair to the traditional usages; and on the other hand partly because the mere fact of bringing current beliefs and customs to the Church's test of the Bible and of antiquity in itself at once opened the sluice-gates to all the worst extravagances of reforming zeal, and made it hard not to run to extremes of innovation.

A new race of English theologians was called

for, who should be free alike from the narrow traditions of Gardiner or Pole and from the hasty revulsions of Cranmer or Ridley or Pilkington—who should be able to meet both Papist and Puritan alike on Catholic grounds and build up again the Church's doctrine and discipline on the solid rock-foundation, which had been seized upon and cleared of false superstructures.

Two names stand out pre-eminent as rising up in the providence of God to meet this need, first that of Richard Hooker and second that of his more long-lived contemporary Lancelot Andrewes.

With Hooker the work was the aim of his life: both the undertaking and the execution of it were worthy of the age of Elizabeth. Andrewes, on the contrary, was only forced into his work by the necessities of the Roman controversy as it grew in heat after the Powder-plot. The work itself was uncongenial to him, being as he was the most pacific of men. But it forced from him what was deeply rooted in him and yet, to the great loss of the English Church, might otherwise never have been expressed, viz. a statement of the position of the English Church from the one man who by his position, his learning

and his piety was pre-eminently qualified to make it.

The chief part of Andrewes' controversy was with Cardinal Bellarmine who, under the pseudonym of Matthew Tortus, attacked King James' book on the oath of allegiance: Andrewes called his reply *Tortura Torti*. When Bellarmine replied in his own name, Andrewes followed him up with his *Responsio ad Bellarminum*.

But quite as significant as the controversy with Bellarmine is the short passage of arms with Cardinal Perron. The Cardinal had taken exception to King James' claim to the title of *Catholic*¹, and by way of justification he drew out under twenty-six heads a comparison between the Church of St. Augustine's day and what he was pleased to think were the tenets of the English Church.

Andrewes followed him point by point in his short *First Answer to Cardinal Perron*; and had no difficulty in showing that, (1) the Cardinal had misstated the position, (2) he had misrepresented the English Church, (3) the contrast when fairly drawn is small and confined to a very few points, (4) these

¹ Compare the discussion of the same point in *Tortura Torti*, p. 303.

points are immaterial ones which the Church is free to vary from time to time and place to place.

In his brief verdict on many of these points Andrewes is giving the maturer judgement of the English Church as the result of the working out of the principles of reform. In some cases he merely repeats with fresh emphasis and maturer conviction what had always been maintained since the beginning of the Reform movement. For example, his main thesis, that the English Church is Catholic, was the claim which had always been made, though the Papists had refused to recognize it. When Parker spoke in an official document of "This Christian Catholick Church of England" and declared the purpose of the Church thus—"We will proceed in the reformation begun, and doubt not, by the help of Christ His grace, of the true unitie to Christ's Catholic Church and of the uprightness of our faith in this province"¹—there

¹ *Preface before a new translation of the Old Testament*. Strype, Parker, iii. 246 (Oxford, 1821), and compare the statement in his will, "*Profiteor me certo credere ac tenere quicquid sancta Catholica ecclesia credit et acceptat*" (ib. p. 334). Compare also the declaration in the seventh of Parker's Articles of Religion in 1559, "That the Book of Common Prayer . . . is agreeable to the scriptures and that it is

remained nothing more definite that could be said by way of claim: but Andrewes in his defence of English Catholicity worked it out in detail and justified it.

The first six points argued against Cardinal Perron deal with Eucharistic doctrine, which had been one of the chief if not *the* chief battle-ground of the Reform movement. It is difficult from the writings of Cranmer, Ridley, and their contemporaries to get a clear view of the doctrine which they held in detail. The general view is clear enough—the Sacrament is an effectual means of grace, the Presence is real but not corporal. It is a view as clear as that of early Fathers. But it had not the precision which the traditions of mediaeval theology demanded. Some of the questions which naturally came up in the conflict between and the Old and the New Learning the early leaders were at a loss to answer, and to many they gave a blank and exaggerated denial; they allowed themselves

catholic, apostolic and most for the advancing of God's glory." *Documentary Annals* i. 265.

Archbishop Grindal in his Metropolitcal Visitation (1576) inquired as to books written by English Papists "against true religion and catholic doctrine now received and established by common authority within this realm" (ib. i. 409).

to be carried away by prejudices, such as those which were prevalent against the canon of the Latin Mass, or the Eucharistic vestments, or even against the innocent term Mass itself; or they allowed themselves to be entrapped into barren scholastic disputations about words or on mysterious points of doctrine where logic and argument necessarily break down: the result was confusion and extravagance.

But by the time of Andrewes the fifty years of reflection have made a great change; there has been time to see the application of the principles—to apply the test of Bible and antiquity: the result is that the English Church speaks through him with no uncertain voice. He can afford to ridicule the idea that the Zwinglian doctrine has any place in her. When the Cardinal spoke of Eucharistic adoration, he replied that we entirely approve such adoration as was spoken of in the passages which the Cardinal quoted from St. Cyril, St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret; and he went on to point out how two of the Cardinal's own quotations were entirely hostile to the theory of transubstantiation.

With regard to Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the Sick, he answers, that we

recognize the primitive custom, but have no need to keep it up, since a sick man may always have his private Communion and *viaticum*.

“Reservation needeth not: the intent is had without it.”

As to the Eucharistic sacrifice and the term Altar, which naturally goes with it, Andrewes is very explicit, and on this point especially we notice the greater maturity of statement as contrasted with the confusion of the earlier leaders of Reform. They, brought up in the midst of great corruptions of the sacrificial doctrine, and eager to free the Church from them, could hardly avoid being prejudiced against both these terms. The more sober and learned men, such as Jewel or Bilson, withstood the popular prejudice, and maintained both sacrifice and altar as being consonant with scripture and antiquity: but it took some time for the English Church as a whole in recovering the pure truth to be able to formulate it as clearly as does Andrewes.

“The Eucharist ever was, and by us is, considered both as a Sacrament and as a Sacrifice.”

He adopts one by one all the patristic quotations, which the Cardinal had cited as if they were antagonistic to the doctrine of

the English Church, and shows that they are consonant with it. It is still more significant that the bishop refuses to be dragged away into vain disputations about terms, such as had continually raged round the phrase "propitiatory for the quick and dead." This old bone of contention was put forward by the Cardinal, but Andrewes in his answer went deeper than mere party watchwords.

"The sacrifice of Christ's death is available for present, absent, living, dead (yea, for them that are yet unborn)."

Thus he refuses to use cant terms or to define the relation of the Sacrifice of Calvary to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, but he uses a term which comprehends both—viz. the term "Sacrifice of Christ's death." Moreover he uses it in such a way as to make it clear that he means to imply the Eucharistic sacrifice as well as the Sacrifice of Calvary: for when he speaks of its being available for present and absent, he must be speaking of the service, not of Calvary. Andrewes' definition is brief, but sound, deep, and conclusive: it is a statement and at the same time an *eirenicon*. But, like many other overtures of peace, it has been mainly ignored or rejected by those to whom it was made, and who find

it more convenient first to misrepresent and then to seek to condemn us.

This naturally leads us on to another point where Andrewes formulates the maturer view of the Reform movement—viz. as to prayer for the dead. In saying that “The sacrifice of Christ’s death is available for” the dead, he goes on to explain: “When we say the dead, we mean it is available for the Apostles, Martyrs, and Confessors and all (because we are all members of one body): these no man will deny.”

The meaning of this explanation is clear: the bishop stipulates that the prayers should be on the primitive lines—that any special dead person participates in the benefits of the Sacrifice simply in his place as one of the Body of Christ: it is a very gentle rebuke of the Roman exaggerations and distortions connected with their requiem services. Later on the bishop deals directly with the point, and says: “For offering and prayer for the dead, there is little to be said against it: it cannot be denied but that it is ancient.” This attitude is made more clear by referring to Andrewes’ own book of prayers, where he constantly and fully prays for the departed.

The earlier Reform leaders were far too much in a state of rebellion against all the abuses which followed upon the degraded views current about purgatory to be able to take so dispassionate a view, or speak so unhesitatingly for what was lawful and right, as against what was perverted and wrong. But in time the custom of prayer for the dead was more clearly seen to be consonant both with the Bible and antiquity: and on that ground Andrewes allows and uses it, thus expressing the maturer view of the English Church.

Again, the verdict on the Papal claims as expressed by Andrewes is more moderate and discriminating, but no less uncompromising, than the view of earlier days. He is content merely to point out the innate absurdity of the Roman claim.

“As for the great mystery that the degrees among Bishops, of Archbishops, Primates and Patriarchs, should be *de iure positivo* but that the Pope should be *de iure divino*, it is so gross (that in one uniform ascent or scale of four degrees one degree only should be *de jure divino* and all the other three *de jure positivo*) that it deserves rather to be scorned than answered.”

Andrewes' answer in fuller detail is given in the larger work, the *Responsio ad Bellarminum*: but what is mainly to be remarked in either case is the sobriety of the reply; it involved a recognition of what could rightly be claimed for the Papacy—viz. an ecclesiastical pre-eminence—but denied as strongly as ever the earlier Protestants had denied the unwarrantable claim to a divine right.

We can only briefly summarize some further points in his answer to Perron. As to relics, the old horror has died away with the abuses which evoked it.

“For the relics of Martyrs (were we sure they were true and uncounterfeit) we would carry to them the regard that becometh us.”

“Had they the power of doing miracles . . . we would esteem them so much the rather.”

But he refuses them worship, and gives no countenance to prayer addressed to the martyrs—though in his own devotions he incorporated Greek prayers with their very explicit commemoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary and All Saints.

He will not quarrel about a mixed chalice, nor about other pieces of ceremonial of more or less importance: of those cited by the Cardinal to our discredit, some, such as,

crossing, he claims as practices of the English Church; and others, such as mixed chalice, lights, lavabo, and incense the bishop used himself. Similarly he describes the quarrel about the number of the Sacraments as a mere *λογομαχία*, and the dispute about minor orders as a *σκιαμαχία*. When the Cardinal cast up against us the Apostolical Succession as an essential condition of the Church, the bishop's reply was very simple:

"We plead there is no interruption in the Succession of our Church. And so this Article fights with a shadow."

In fine, to Cardinal Perron's twenty-six characteristics of catholicity his reply is various: to some he replies, We have these as much as you; to others he replies, They are immaterial and not essential to catholicity; to others he replies, The test proposed is new, and therefore, as a test, erroneous; to others again his answer is, We partly agree with you and we partly differ: so far as Rome is Catholic, England agrees; but, where Rome parts company with antiquity, England parts company with her.

There are, then, two points which mainly emerge from the whole struggle. (1) Andrewes' sense of the proportion of the faith: he will

not allow unimportant things to be magnified till they acquire a fictitious importance. He maintains the clear distinction between fundamental doctrines, on which the Church speaks unhesitatingly, and subsidiary doctrines, about which she is content to give guidance or suggestion rather than to issue commands. Rome was continually obscuring the distinction and upsetting the balance of faith; and still she alienates half Christendom from herself by her habit of exaggerating minor points till they develop into monstrosities, and then erecting them as dogmas essential to the faith. We owe it largely to Andrewes that we were set upon a scunder foundation, with a firm line laid down for us upon fundamentals, *as being fundamental*, and a wide margin of liberty and toleration allowed for us in things of secondary importance.

Again, we owe largely to Andrewes the constructive view and the positive statement of our position. The work of earlier reformers was to protest, to formulate our differences from Papist or Puritan. The Thirty-nine Articles express this attitude; it is at once both the weakness and the strength of that document. But the later divines, with Andrewes at their head, reversed

the situation, went down to the positive foundations of the reconstructed building, and emphasized not our Protestantism but our Catholicity.

We have spoken so far mainly from Andrewes' controversial works, because these, though uncongenial to his nature, show most sharply the doctrinal position at which he had arrived, and therefore are most apt to prove him to be a developed exemplification of Reformation principles.

But the other and more congenial sides of his character and work show the same thing. As a preacher and teacher apart from controversy he shows that solid theological grasp and mastery which can only come from familiarity with the fundamentals and with the historic foundations. The Reform movement had sent its devotees back to the original sources, not to schoolmen or theological manuals. At the opening of his reply Andrewes twits Perron with not quoting St. Austin direct, but through the medium of a quotation in Zwingli. The incident is very characteristic. As in controversy the strength of the English champions lay in their first-hand knowledge of the sources to which they appealed, viz. the Bible and antiquity, so

in uncontroversial teaching a man like Andrewes was irresistible because of the overpowering momentum which resulted from the mass of his solid learning combined with the force of his deep conviction.

The sermons are so massive that it is difficult not to be surprised at the popularity which they acquired: no doubt the wit and tenderness exhibited in them contributed a good deal to this; and it must be remembered that many of the features which make Andrewes' sermons difficult to a modern reader were points which recommended them to the audience of that date: the conceits, the curt quaintnesses, the abruptnesses, the tags of Latin, these were all part of the fashion of the day. Andrewes may himself have done something to make the fashion, but there is no doubt that a large part of it was inherited.

But what makes a sermon great and forcible to the listener is in every age and place the same thing, viz. the personality of the preacher. Once again we find ourselves confronted with Andrewes the man.

If we open the book of Private Prayers, again it is the same thing: we have already referred to passages among the prayers which it was interesting to note as exemplifying his doc-

trinal position: but what fascinates and enthrals the reader in the prayers, is again the character of the man, which shines out clearly from the pages, and all the more clearly where the writing is "slubbered over with his tears." This character too we claim as among the fairest firstfruits of the working out of the Reform principles.

It is inevitable that a man should bear to some extent the impress of his time, and Andrewes is no exception: but at any rate he shows less than most men the failings of his time. He cannot be acquitted of the great failing of churchmen of that era, in identifying too closely the monarchy and the Church, and maintaining an extravagant theory of royalty: but at any rate Andrewes surpassed his brother prelates in boldness and independence.

Again, the calamitous blending of ecclesiastical and civil authority, which was so marked a feature of the Tudors and the early Stuarts, and which wrought such havoc under Laud's *régime*, was evident though less marked in Andrewes' case: he took his place in the Star Chamber, or the Court of High Commission, or sat at the Board of the Privy Council; but (as Bishop Buckeridge recorded in his funeral

sermon), "He would meddle little in civil or temporal affairs, being out of his profession and element."

He left therefore little mark upon political affairs and, so far as can be seen, his administration of his dioceses was not remarkable in any special way. The force and power of his character is to be judged more from the lives of those whom he impressed. In various ways, as prelate, preacher, and confessor, he cast a spell over his contemporaries the potency of which it is difficult now to estimate; but there is no doubt that it was one of the most real and the most entirely good influences of the day.

He held up a new standard of what loyal sons and daughters of the Church ought to be, and by his example encouraged them to aim at it. They, as they looked at him, felt the subtle influence, and probably could hardly give an account of it: we, as we look back at his life, only get distantly into touch with the personal influence, but we can give an account of it in a way impossible to them; we have only to open the book of his private prayers and there the secret is revealed.

He was what his prayers made him. In his prayer book he accumulated the richest of

Christian treasures : all the choicest treasures of the Bible—the outpourings of the heart of prophet, wise man, and psalmist, in praise and penitence and prayer—are found here blended with the choicest bits of ancient devotion gathered from Eastern and Western Christendom and even from Jewish rites. This was his spiritual food: and thereupon there was formed and nurtured a character, gentle with the tenderness of the psalms, strong with the sternness of the prophets, as wide as the width of his quotations, deep as the wells of piety from which he drew them—a character which, as we look at it, both shames and encourages us.

This life and character I have ventured to call the firstfruits of the working out of the principles of the English Reform of Religion. And I hope I have justified the statement.

But before closing let me remind you that it is only the firstfruits. Much remained to be worked out after Andrewes' time, and some remains still.

It is a fatal mistake to look upon the Reformation as a thing once for all done and finished in a few years in the middle of the sixteenth century: we have seen how Archbishop Parker conceived himself to be only at

the beginning of the work : and we have seen how Lancelot Andrewes carried it on, and matured it. There still remained to be done the work of Laud, the work of the Restoration divines, and the work of the Evangelical and Oxford Revivals—each an important stage in the working out of the Reformation principles.

And as we look forward there is still a good deal left to be done—prejudices to be cleared away at home and abroad, and the way thus made possible for a more searching and fair appeal to Bible and antiquity. We still remain entrenched between the attacks of Romanism and Puritanism where Andrewes and the rest found us, and where they left us even more securely fortified. But we must keep our hand loyally to the work : we must with Andrewes frankly recognize the breaches in our walls, and with him too earnestly pray that God will build up the breaches.

IX.

I.

THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH.

No. IX.

The Church Historical Society.

President:—THE RT. REVEREND M. CREIGHTON, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

The Bible in the Church (I).

BY THE

REV. R. L. OTTLEY, M.A.,

PRINCIPAL OF THE PUSEY HOUSE, OXFORD.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

LONDON:

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,

NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.; 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.

BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.

NEW YORK: E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.

1896.

SUMMARY.

	PAGE
The demand for 'Authority' in matters of faith : how far satisfied by our Lord's teaching	5
✓ I. THE CHURCH'S EXISTENCE EARLIER THAN THAT OF THE BIBLE	10
II. THE USE OF THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH : . . .	12
1. The confirmation and enlargement of faith.	
2. The Church to teach, the Bible to prove.	
3. The nurture and education of the spiri- tual life.	
4. Contact with the Person of Christ.	
III. DIVERGENT VIEWS AS TO THE RELATION BETWEEN THE BIBLE AND THE CHURCH	28
1. The view of the Roman Church stated and criticized.	
2. The view of Chillingworth and others examined.	
IV. DIFFERENT DEGREES OF AUTHORITY IN REGARD TO CHURCH DOCTRINES	41
The practical use of the different sources of truth.	

THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH.



Ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, στήκετε, καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν.

THE very form of our subject suggests the remark that the demand for guidance—for authority in matters of faith—is characteristic of our time. It is only natural that in days of much positive and precise knowledge, of rapid processes and quickly attained results, there should be a widespread impatience of uncertainty and delay in matters of the highest concern. It does not lie within the scope of this lecture to discuss the question of authority at length: but in mentioning the Bible and the Church we cannot forget that we are naming two of the principal means which God has put within our reach for the attainment of religious and spiritual truth; and it is well at the outset to remind ourselves how real are the limitations under which any demand for clear and express “authority” can meet with satisfaction. Our

blessed Lord's own method in answering difficult questions plainly indicates that there is, and must necessarily be, an element of Divine reserve in the communication of eternal truth to men. For although there is much that we supremely need to know, there is also much which it would not profit us to know, much that in our present state we can never hope to know. In a world of mystery, of broken lights and shadows, in the midst of a scheme most imperfectly comprehended, "in the abyss," as Pascal writes, "of that boundless immensity of which he knows nothing," man has no reason to expect that he will find more express guidance than is sufficient to direct him safely towards his true goal. There is enough certainly revealed to reassure us, enough to give us hope and good confidence, enough to keep us sober-minded, humble, expectant, watchful; but it is contrary to all analogy to suppose that there should be, under present conditions of human probation, clear-cut or positive answers to every question which our restlessness or curiosity, our indolence or timidity, might prompt us to ask. There is need nowadays of the warning of a seventeenth century divine, "A false

conceit is crept into the minds of men, to think the points of religion that be manifest to be certain petty points, scarce worth the hearing. Those, yea those be great, and none but those, that have great disputes about them. It is not so Those [points] that are necessary He hath made plain; those that are not plain, not necessary. A way of peace then there shall be whereof all parts shall agree even in the midst of a world of controversies; that there need not such ado in complaining, if men did not delight rather to be treading mazes than to walk in the paths of peace¹."

Yes: effort, suspense, perplexity, pain, the discipline of uncertainty and of deferred hope even in the search after truth—we are not to be spared these; it were not good that we should be spared. For we may remember two points which are prominent in our Lord's teaching: first, He reveals our true relation to God as that of filial dependence; we are children, not servants; we are sons under moral discipline and education. Accordingly, the training to which we are subjected is one that aims at

¹ Andrewes, *Sermon 3 On the Nativity*.

the development and enrichment of a filial character. It resembles the best type of education of which we can form an idea in its "combination of authority and liberty"¹; in its care for character as well as for enlightenment; in its appeal to conscience as well as to intellect; in its demand for courage and trust as well as for fairness and patience in reasoning. The discipline of sons cannot be exactly on a level with the direction and supervision of servants. No mere dictation of explicit doctrines or precepts could develop in us first the desire, and then the capacity, of intelligent co-operation with the Divine purpose, or could stimulate the temper of filial reverence, dependence, trust, and love. For the purpose of moral education—for the awakening of religious affections—it may well be that a *minimum* of authoritative guidance will be the most effective. "Henceforth I call you not servants," says our Lord to His disciples; "for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you"².

¹ See R. W. Church, *Pascal and other Sermons*, p. 218.

² S. John xv. 15.

Again, Jesus Christ taught mankind the supremacy of spiritual and eternal over temporal interests. Doubtless there is a certain spiritual discipline involved in suspense and uncertainty which is necessary and wholesome for beings constituted as we are; and if we study our Lord's method of training His disciples, we notice that to Him their ultimate spiritual welfare is always the first consideration. He does not require of them a mere blind self-attachment to His person, an unquestioning or unreasoning acceptance of His doctrine. He ever aims at awakening in them spiritual intelligence; He encourages them to ask questions; He is at pains to keep alive in them the sense of mystery, imparting to them truth as they are *able to bear it*, and concealing under the veil of parable spiritual truths which at the same time He illuminates by symbolic acts of supernatural power. He does not simply impart information, He seems rather to aim at deepening understanding. And here we have a signal mark of true religion. For, as Pascal points out, "God being hidden, every religion which does not declare that He is hidden must be false; and every religion which does not give the reason for this,

fails to be instructive. Christianity accomplishes all this: *Vere Tu es Deus absconditus*¹."

I.

Accordingly, with our eyes fixed on Jesus Christ, keeping in view the general conditions of the revelation given by Him, and bearing in mind "the entangled and complicated character of all human questions²," let us approach the subject which is to engage our attention this evening—that of the Bible in the Church. And first the question arises, How is Jesus Christ represented in the world now—since the time when at the Ascension His visible presence was withdrawn? The answer of the New Testament is plain enough. Christ is represented in the world by a Church, or Society; a body which is no fortuitous aggregation of individuals, but a divine creation, called into being to perpetuate and extend on earth the Redeemer's work; to be the visible guardian of the revelation made in and by Jesus Christ, *the pillar and ground of the truth*, the witness of *the faith once delivered to the saints*; to be

¹ *Pensées*, iii. 7.

² R. W. Church, *Human Life and its Conditions*, p. 164.

the channel of God's gifts, the treasure-house of His grace, the abiding place on earth of His eternal Spirit.

This much will be generally conceded ; but further it may be taken for a matter of historical fact that this Christian Society existed before there was a Christian Bible. There was a living body indwelt by the Spirit of God before there was an inspired New Testament. There were congregations of believers requiring instruction in Christian faith and duty, long before either gospels or epistles were written. The New Testament is clearly written for *Christians*¹ ; it presupposes an antecedent knowledge of the faith ; and a moment's thought will remind us that each Church to which, for example, an apostolic epistle was addressed, could only read and understand such a document by the light of a faith which it already possessed. In all communities so addressed there would be preserved the Scriptures which from time to time might reach them, and the traditional creed in accordance with which the written Word would naturally be interpreted. Thus beyond all question the Church received

¹ See Dr. Hawkins' (late Provost of Oriel College) *Bampton Lectures* (1840), No. ii, pp. 38 f.

the Christian meaning of the Scriptures, at least in broad outline, before she received the Scriptures themselves. As a matter of fact the New Testament was not completed for at least sixty—probably more than sixty—years after the Day of Pentecost. Here then we start with a plain fact which obviously has an important bearing on our subject: viz. that the Christian Church was planted and flourished long before the Christian Scriptures existed. The general consent of the Church, gradually ascertained and enunciated in her synods, determined the contents and limits of the canon; to the Church the Scriptures belong; she is their guardian and interpreter, and she appeals to them for confirmation of the faith which she has cherished and handed down from the first day until now¹.

II.

The Church, then, and the Bible exist in the world, or rather co-exist, as “two authorities mutually corroborative of each other, and so far as individual interpretation of each [is concerned], mutually corrective of each other²”;

¹ Note A.

² Bp. Forbes, *An Explanation of the XXXIX Articles*, p. 95.

and this brings us to the question, What are the principles which actually guide the Church in her use of Scripture? The answer to this question will next occupy our attention.

1. First, then, the Church gives the Bible to her children, and earnestly encourages them in the study of it, with a view to confirming the faith she has taught them; to enable them to fill in, so to speak, and give substance to, the *form or outline of sound words* which they have already learned in the Creed. Two good illustrations of this use of the Bible are furnished in the New Testament itself. S. Luke, for example, explains the purpose of his gospel to be, that Theophilus may *know the certainty concerning the things* wherein he had been orally instructed¹. Again, in the Acts, we find the Jews at Beroea commended because they *received the word with all readiness of mind, examining the Scriptures* of the Old Testament daily, *whether these things* (the doctrines concerning Christ taught by S. Paul) *were so*². On the other hand, the case of the Ethiopian eunuch before he was instructed by S. Philip illustrates the need

¹ S. Luke i. 4.

² Acts xvii. 11.

of some authoritative guidance, of a "hermeneutical tradition," in the reading of Scripture¹. It is plain that the Church in exhorting her children to study Scripture for themselves, previously takes care to give them "the right point of view for their study²." As Hooker points out, "Utterly to infringe the force and strength of man's testimony were to shake the very fortress of God's truth. For whatsoever we believe concerning salvation by Christ, although the Scripture be therein the ground of our belief; yet the authority of man is, if we mark it, the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of the Scripture. The Scripture could not teach us the things that are of God, unless we did credit men who have taught us that the words of Scripture do signify those things³." But the Church having once imparted to her children the right point of view, impresses on them the importance and value of the private study of Scripture. Subjects which the traditional faith orally delivered had only sketched in outline, or had left doubtful and obscure,

¹ Acts viii. 30, 31.

² Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 63.

³ *Eccl. Pol.* ii. 7, § 3.

are in Scripture "writ large,"—are expanded or illuminated. "Men fall into error," says S. Leo in the first chapter of his celebrated *Tome*, "when, being hindered by some obscurity in knowing the truth, they recur, not to the prophets, or apostles, or evangelists, but to themselves¹." "This," says S. Chrysostom, "is what I am always advising you and will never cease advising you to do, viz. not merely to give your attention to what is said here [in church], but also when you are at home to be constantly occupied with reading the divine Scriptures. . . . The apostles and prophets set before all men plainly and clearly, as being the common teachers of the world, what proceeded from them, that each individual might be able even of himself to learn from the mere reading the sense of what they said; and foretelling this the prophet exclaimed, *They shall be all taught of God*². . . . Let every one when he returns home take the Bible in his hands and reflect on the meaning of what is said

¹ *Ep. ad Flav. i.*

² *Opera*, tom. i, pp. 737, 739 [ed. Ben.]. The teaching of S. Chrysostom on this point is collected in *Meditations from S. Chrysostom on the Study of the Word of God*, by R. King (Dublin, 1833).

here, that is, if he would derive permanent and full benefit from the Scripture¹. . . . Great are the advantages to be derived from such study. . . . It gives wings and elevation to the soul illuminated thus with the beams of the Sun of Righteousness ; . . . and what our bodily nourishment effects for the support of our [natural] strength, this the reading [we speak of] does for the spirit of man. For it is spiritual nutriment, and such as nerves the understanding and gives power to the soul ; improving its tone, imparting philosophic views, leaving it no more an easy prey to senseless passions, but giving buoyancy to its wing, and bearing it upward, so to speak, to heaven itself." "This," Chrysostom elsewhere says, "is the source from which have originated our thousand ills—ignorance of the Scriptures. Hence hath shot up the widespread pollution of heresies ; hence the wasted lives, hence the fruitless labours. For as they who are destitute of this earthly light are unable to walk in a straight course, so in the same way they that see not the rays which beam forth from the divine Scriptures, must needs fall into many

¹ *Opera*, tom. iii, p. 73.

errors, and that continually, seeing that they walk in darkness of the worst kind¹.”

2. These representative passages prepare us for the important thesis constantly maintained by the Church for fifteen centuries, viz. that Scripture is the ultimate criterion of the Church's teaching on matters of faith. Our sixth Article is simply stating the universal belief of early ages in its declaration that “whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.” It is not too much to say, that “the whole weight of authority” is in favour of the doctrine of the sixth Article². The voice of Christian antiquity on this point is unanimous, and I need only quote some typical utterances. Athanasius of Alexandria tells us that “the holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are of themselves all-sufficient for the enunciation of truth;” and that the Scriptures “are the fountains of salvation” in which “alone the doctrine of godliness is proclaimed³.” Cyril of Jeru-

¹ *Opera*, tom. iv, p. 281 ; tom. ix, p. 426.

² Palmer, *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, Part iii, ch. i.

³ *Ath. c. Gent.* i ; *Fest. Epist.* xxxix.

salem teaches that "Nothing at all ought to be delivered concerning the divine and holy mysteries of faith without the Holy Scriptures;" and again he plainly says to his converts, "Do not believe me simply unless you receive the proof of what I tell you out of the Scriptures¹." "Keep that faith only," he elsewhere insists, "which the Church is now giving to you and which is certificated out of the whole of Scripture²." The witness of the West is similar: "In those things," declares Augustine, "which are openly set down in Scripture, all things are found which embrace both faith and conduct³." For the later Church of the East a reference to John Damascene will suffice, "All things that are delivered to us by the law, the prophets, the apostles, and the evangelists we receive, acknowledge, and reverence, seeking for nothing beyond these⁴." The same doctrine is taught by many mediaeval writers, and is affirmed by Roman Catholic divines of

¹ *Catech.* iv. 12; cp. 17.

² *Catech.* v. 12.

³ *de Doc.* ii. 9.

⁴ *de Orth. Fid.* i. 1. A large number of quotations similar in purport will be found in Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, l.c.; or in Bp. E. H. Browne's *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*, pp. 140 f.

authority, such as Cardinal du Perron¹. As late as the eighteenth century the Gallican doctor du Pin approved of our sixth Article in language to the following effect: "This (viz. that Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation) we will gladly admit, provided that tradition be not excluded which does not set forth new articles of faith, but confirms and explains those things which are contained in Holy Scripture, and fences them by new safeguards against those who are otherwise minded, so that nothing new is said, but only the old in a new way²." These are so many restatements of the axiom that what is *de fide* must be capable of proof from Scripture. The tradition of faith handed down by the Church is in fact identical with the teaching of Scripture, and is confirmed by it.

At this point we may observe in passing that the body of revealed truths which depend upon this primary degree of authority, which are at once delivered by the Church and corroborated by the testimony of Scripture,

¹ See Palmer, l. c.

² Pusey, *Eirenicon*, p. 213. Palmer even claims the Council of Trent in favour of the sixth Article (l. c.). See below.

is smaller than is sometimes supposed; and further, there is undoubtedly a difference in the degree of practical prominence assigned to particular doctrines in the Bible and in the Fathers of the Church. In other words, doctrines do not by any means stand all on one level; while some are set forth as most essential, others seem to be insisted on less emphatically. S. Cyril of Jerusalem says expressly that the Creeds were framed in such wise as to embrace the "most essential" or "distinctive" doctrines (τὰ καριώτατα) of Scripture¹. And it is well to recollect that while the disputes of Christendom have been mainly concerned with points of doctrine secondary in importance, there has been a most impressive degree of unanimity in regard to the central doctrines of our faith. The caution must also be added that what has been already said must be limited strictly to matters of *faith*. In regard to rites, ceremonies, usages, institutions, the office of the Church is obviously more extensive. A large discretion has ever been allowed to particular Churches in regard to traditions and ceremonies, which as the thirty-fourth Article

¹ *Catech.* v. 12.

says, "at all times have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word." Scripture, in fact, appears to sanction a power of regulating externals, provided that no rite or discipline be actually contrary to Scripture¹. The distinction between a tradition of doctrines, and a tradition in regard to ecclesiastical usages, must be carefully borne in mind if we are to avoid troublesome confusion, and to measure accurately the degree of divergence which exists between different branches of the Catholic Church.

3. We pass to a third, and happily undisputed, function of Scripture. The Church sends her children to the Bible in order that they may there find nourishment for the spiritual life. Religion means the life of friendship between God and man, and the Bible is in great part the story of that friendship. It records the spiritual conflicts and experiences of men who believed themselves to be called into the life of divine fellowship, and strove to rise to its requirements. Scripture may be regarded,

¹ Note B.

from this point of view, as a manual of spiritual instruction and devotion; and in her service-books the Church seems to recognize a threefold method of using the Bible for this purpose. The daily lessons appointed to be read in church cover a somewhat large portion of Holy Writ. The reading of them serves to impress on the hearer's mind some general truths relating to God's judgments, and the laws of His moral government. It deepens the sense of His continuous converse with mankind, of His providential care, of His unchanging purpose of grace. In reciting the Epistles and Gospels on the other hand the Church seems to commend to us the duty of devout meditation on short and pregnant passages of Holy Writ; she sets before us some incident in the life of our Lord, some deep utterance, some work of power, which illustrates the laws of God's kingdom and the methods of His redemptive action. Once more, in the Psalms she gives us a manual of personal devotion. She puts the Psalms into our hands in order to train us to think the thoughts and utter the language of love. She teaches us how God should be approached and adored, and what He is to the individual

soul that seeks Him—its refuge, its strong rock, its hiding-place, the satisfaction of its thirst, the supreme object of its devotion and love. The Psalms in every generation have supplied the children of God with words which they may take with them¹ to the throne of grace, and in which they may find utterance for all the varied moods and phases of the spiritual life—penitence, contrition, fear, adoration, joy, self-surrender, exultation, thanksgiving, praise. Thus, speaking generally, a threefold use of Scripture seems to be encouraged and sanctioned by the Church². For she looks on the Bible committed to her care as the food of souls, as “milk” or “strong meat” according to the capacity of him who feeds upon it³. S. Chrysostom compares Holy Scripture in this aspect to a garden or fair pasture, where the soul may range at will. “Many and various,” he says, “as in a meadow, are the flowers that I can observe in the lection which has been read to us; many the rose-bushes, many the violets, nor less numerous the lilies than they; aye, scattered

¹ Hosea xiv. 2.

² I owe this suggestion to a sermon by Professor Lock.

³ Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 2.

too on every side in diversified abundance, the fruits of the Spirit, and sweet the fragrance of their odour. Or rather, it is no mere meadow, but even a paradise [that one finds] in the reading of the divine Scriptures. For it is not bare perfume only that these flowers yield, but fruit also, adapted for nourishing the soul¹." "Pleasant is the meadow," he elsewhere says², "pleasant is the garden, but far more pleasant the reading of the Scriptures. For there indeed you have the flowers that bloom to die; but here thoughts born to live. There the zephyr blows; but here we have the breathing of the Spirit. There you hear the chirping of the grasshoppers; but here the melody of the prophets. There pleasure is enjoyed in the seeing; here profit in the reading. The garden is confined to one spot; the Scriptures are in all parts of the world. The garden is subject to the inevitable influence of the seasons; the Scriptures both in winter and in summer are fair in their foliage, plentiful in their fruit."

Thus to the true children of God the Bible is a celestial treasury of all medicines profitable for the health of the soul; a necessary

¹ *Opera*, tom. ii, p. 2.

² *Ibid.* tom. iii, p. 386.

aid to the growth of Christian character, a fountain of grace, an unfailing source of comfort, healing, and light. And indeed no critical conclusions can ever really impair or undermine this spiritual function of the Bible. It is, and ever will be, what Chrysostom in glowing words describes it to be, "an unruffled haven, an impregnable fortress, a tower that cannot be moved, a glory which none can take from us, armour impenetrable to the foe, a source of courage that will not shrink, pleasure for evermore, and everything excellent that one could name¹."

4. Once more, the Church sends us to the Bible in order that we may find Jesus Christ. "The key that lets men into the Scriptures," says Archbishop Laud, "is the tradition of the Church; but when they are in, they hear Christ Himself immediately speaking in Scripture to the faithful, and 'His sheep' do not only 'hear' but know 'His voice'²." The

¹ *Op. tom. v, p. 519.*

² *Conf. with Fisher, § 16 (Works, vol. 2, p. 115).* A Roman Catholic writer quoted by Laud says that, like the Samaritans, who first heard the report of the Samaritan woman and then heard Christ themselves (S. John iv. 42), "*sic certe fidelis, sacra scriptura cognita, et in ipsa Christo invento, plus verbis Christi in ea credit quam cuicunque praedicatori, quam etiam ecclesiae testificanti,*" etc.

Gospels especially have the peculiar merit of bringing the soul into contact with a personality. "The Church," says Dr. Mozley in his essay on Blanco White, "receives with humble faith all these that the froward reason calls legends, and recites them in regular liturgical order to her children as the simple truth, the history of what has been upon this earth. Blessed privilege to hear them! amidst a jarring world those disclosures of the supernatural strike deep into the heart that wants to realize God's presence. There He is; He lives and moves as a real God; He loves and concerns Himself for His creatures; He breaks forth from the veil of nature, and uncovers Himself to us. Every day we hear those Gospels which tell us what He did when He lived upon this earth—His compassions and divine sweetness, His humility and majesty supreme in mortal shape. What untold depths lie in those simple accounts which the evangelists have written, and in those acts of pity to the blind, the lame, the deaf, the dumb, the sick, the dying, and the dead. What an image do they raise in our minds of our blessed Lord in His earthly form! Great privilege indeed to hear these holy narratives read! May they go on

forming and deepening an image of Him which will stay in us and never go away¹! And what is true of the Gospels is in due measure and degree true of the other parts of Scripture. The Old Testament indeed testifies of Christ; He is present there by His Spirit. In type and prophecy, in narrative and song, in ordinance and precept, in proverb and saw, the Old Testament witnesses to Him, points to Him, looks for Him. But in the New Testament, and especially in the Gospels, we seem almost with the bodily eyes to behold Him moving to and fro among men, in His majesty and His meekness, in His heavenly repose and His beneficent activity. The Gospels seem, to use the vivid expression of S. Paul, almost to "placard" Jesus Christ visibly before us². In devout study of them the benediction of a Divine presence makes itself felt. "Thy holy Scripture," cries Henri Perrêyve, "is another eucharist! Thou art living, Thou art present in the sacred pages, in each word of Thy Scriptures, as in the tabernacle³!"

¹ *Essays*, vol. ii, p. 128.

² Gal. iii. 1.

³ *Méditations sur les saints ordres*, p. 27. Erasmus in the preface to his edition of the N. T. (1516), (quoted by Westcott and Hort, *The New Testament in the original Greek*)

III.

So far we have been concerned with the general principles on which the Bible is used in the Church; but in order to have any degree of completeness, the treatment of our subject must include some reference to the views which prevail in different communions as to the relation in which the Bible stands to the tradition of the Church. The view which the English Church adopts in her Articles is, as we believe, the immemorial doctrine of Christendom. In a Canon of Convocation, which directs the clergy to subscribe the Articles, the English Church bids her preachers be careful "that they never teach aught in a sermon to be religiously held and believed by the people except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and what the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected from that same doctrine." The sixth Article declares that Holy Scripture "containeth all things necessary to salvation." The Church accordingly rejects all doctrines

says: "They [the N. T. scriptures] reproduce a living image of that most sacred mind [of Christ], and in such wise present Christ Himself speaking, healing, dying, rising again, indeed in His entirety, that He would even be less visible if we actually saw Him before our eyes."

that are repugnant to Scripture; and all things which cannot be proved from Scripture, either by express statement, or by way of inference, she excludes from the substance of necessary faith. "All articles of faith," in short, "are proved by Scripture, and by a universal tradition establishing the right interpretation, and corroborating the testimony of Scripture¹." Any addition therefore to the *substance* of the Church's faith is impossible. The catholic Faith is a deposit once for all committed to the Church. There can be illumination of the Church's consciousness, elucidation and development of her terminology, there can be wider and deeper insight into the infinite significance of her creed; but there can be no addition to the body of truth once revealed. "The apostles," says Irenaeus, "poured into the Church as into a rich treasure-house all that pertains to truth²."

i. The view of our brethren in the Roman Church, at any rate as sometimes held and taught nowadays, differs from the above view in that it places tradition and Scripture on a level as independent sources of truth.

¹ Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, pt. iii, c. i.

² Iren. *adv. Haer.* iii. 4. 1.

The decree of Trent declares that the "truth and discipline (of the Gospel) is contained in written books and in unwritten traditions, which, having been received by the apostles from Christ's own mouth, or by the apostles themselves at the dictation of the Holy Ghost, have been transmitted as if from hand to hand, and have reached us. [The synod] following the examples of the orthodox fathers, receives and venerates with an equal feeling of piety and reverence all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament, since one God is the author of each; and also the traditions themselves, relating both to faith and morals, as having been orally dictated by Christ or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by a continuous succession in the Catholic Church¹."

This Canon as it stands does not necessarily do more than reassert what we have seen to be the ancient view, if it be conceded that the traditions "confirm and are identically the same with the doctrines of Scripture²." But in view of the difficulty which some Roman Catholic writers evidently feel in reconciling certain newly defined dogmas

¹ Sess. iv.

² Palmer, l. c.

with the faith of the early Church, there has undoubtedly been a tendency to expand the definition of Trent in the direction of making tradition an independent authority in matters of *faith*. Thus a modern Romanist would practically agree with Dr. Wiseman when he says, "Tradition, or the *doctrines* delivered down and the *unwritten Word of God* are one and the same thing. . . . By the *unwritten Word of God* we mean a *body of doctrines*, which, in consequence of express declarations in the written Word, we believe not to have been committed to writing, but delivered by Christ to His apostles, and by the apostles to their successors¹." This, if words mean anything, implies that there are not only points of usage, and institutions, but also *points of faith, doctrines*, which are

¹ Wiseman, *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church* (London, 1836), vol. i, pp. 60, 61. On the other hand, contrast the declaration of Cassander, quoted by Palmer, l. c. p. 15. "This tradition is *nothing else but the explanation and interpretation of Scripture itself*, so that it might be not improperly said, that Scripture is a sort of tradition folded and sealed, and tradition is scripture unfolded and unsealed." Cp. Hawkins, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 317 f. In illustration of the modern Roman position, see Card. Franzelin, quoted by Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 58; and cp. Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, note 25, p. 252.

not contained in Scripture, but are handed down by unwritten tradition from the apostles. I am not concerned to press this point in a controversial spirit; but it is only fair to remark that there is a discrepancy between earlier and later expositions of the Tridentine rule,—later writers inclining at any rate to the position that Scripture is only one, though certainly a chief source of Catholic truth, and that an article of faith may rest on the tradition of the Church alone, or even on the definition of the Pope. “In matters of dogma,” says Father Clarke, “she (the Church) cannot change one iota of the faith once delivered to the saints.” So far this statement accords with the well-known rule of S. Vincent of Lerins, in the twenty-third chapter of his *Commonitorium*; but what follows? “Or (i.e. nor can the Church) reverse a doctrine once defined by the infallible voice of the supreme pontiff¹.” On this statement I have no wish to comment, beyond observing that the two clauses would seem to involve an extreme inconsistency. On the other hand, it might be

¹ Clarke, *The Pope and the Bible*, p. 53. On the inconsistency of the Roman position, see Palmer, l. c. p. 17 f.

contended that the Roman Church has not authoritatively endorsed this interpretation of the Tridentine decree, which at present must be ranked as an opinion maintained by some Romanist writers¹. The Roman Church would not seem to be officially committed to the view that Scripture contains only a portion of the Catholic faith ; but certainly this seems to be the opinion of some modern Romanist writers.

With three brief remarks, however, we must leave this portion of our subject :

(1) The modern view of tradition as an independent source of doctrinal truth closely corresponds with a tendency challenged by Bishop Andrewes in the seventeenth century, —the tendency to enlarge the area of what is *de fide*. To Andrewes it appeared that the Roman controversialists of his day were lacking in the sense of proportion. Bellarmine, for instance, refused the title "Catholic" to King James I, on the ground that he disputed such minor points of belief or practice as the invocation of saints, transubstantiation, and

¹ The fact appears to be that there is a real inconsistency between earlier Roman statements on tradition (see Palmer, l. c.), and the view of writers like Dr. Wiseman, or Card. Franzelin.

the temporal claims of the Papacy. Andrewes, with a more just historical sense, was at pains to distinguish between what was certainly and clearly *de fide*, and what was merely probable, or allowable, as matter of opinion, or even of sentiment. It was a necessary and vital distinction,—never more important to bear in mind than at this moment, when the whole question of reunion is under consideration. We English churchmen are at one with the ancient Church in being rightly jealous of any innovation in, or addition to, the creed of Christendom.

(2) The modern Roman view is shown to be unsatisfying by the fact that there has hitherto been hesitation in boldly acting upon it. In spite of the theoretical equality of rank assigned to Scripture and unwritten tradition as sources of doctrinal truth, Roman theologians have frequently betrayed anxiety to prove points both of doctrine and discipline from Scripture alone. Thus, while Bossuet objected to the temporal supremacy of the Pope as non-scriptural, Milner endeavours to find scriptural warrant for the Invocation of Saints¹; and Dr. Wiseman attempts to

¹ Palmer, l. c. pp. 16, 17.

discover support in the Bible for other controverted points, such as the granting of indulgences, and the honour due to relics¹.

(3) On the other hand, we cannot but observe that the tendency to exalt tradition coincides with a widespread disregard of Scripture—a practical discouragement of the laity from searching the Scriptures for themselves. I know that individual Romanist writers have, much to their honour, spoken earnestly of the duty of biblical study; it is indeed expressly stated by Father Clarke that “the authorities of the [Roman] Catholic Church—Pope, bishops, and clergy—are anxious to see the Scriptures widely circulated among the people².” But the facts of the case seem to point to a very different conclusion. Those who had any opportunity of reading the remarkable preface of M. Henri Lasserre to his translation of the Four Gospels into French, will remember his acknowledgement that the great mass of Roman Catholic lay-people are profoundly ignorant of Scripture³. This general ignorance I refer

¹ See Dr. Wiseman's *Lectures* (already cited), vol. ii, pp. 73, 102, 103, 129 f. (referred to by Hawkins, l. c. p. 30).

² See *The Pope and the Bible*, a pamphlet by R. F. Clarke, S.J., p. 9.

³ Note C.

to as an undeniable fact, without pausing to point out all its consequences. I will only say that under such circumstances there is no safeguard, such as there would be if the study of Scripture were generally encouraged in the Church of Rome, against unscriptural doctrine being taught and accepted within her pale; and as we have seen, the unanimous voice of antiquity declares that a doctrine which is unscriptural is *ipso facto* excluded from the area of what is *de fide*. In fact the word "catholic" can only be justly predicated of what is clearly set down in Scripture or has been directly inferred from its express statements by the ancient Church.

ii. Another view of Scripture which we ought briefly to consider is summarily expressed in the celebrated declaration of William Chillingworth (b. 1602; d. 1644), "The Bible, I say, the Bible only is the religion of Protestants¹"; or in the position which we sometimes hear defended, that "each individual ought to examine Scripture for himself before he believes any doctrine." Now of course Scripture might suffice to be the primary teacher of the Catholic faith if it had certain qualifica-

¹ *Religion of Protestants*, I. vi. 56.

tions which it conspicuously, and happily, lacks. There has been at times a tendency among Protestant theologians to regard revelation mainly as a definite and ascertainable system or body of doctrines; and certainly if Scripture had the formal precision, the definiteness or clearness of a *system*, it might well serve as a primary teacher. When, however, Protestant writers praise the "clearness" of Scripture, one feels inclined to protest against the readiness with which without intending it men "talk deceitfully for God¹." For Scripture knows nothing of formal system. On the contrary, its principal value lies in the unsystematic and occasional form of its different books. "The actual form of the Scriptures," says Dr. Hawkins, "by its very indirectness, want of system, and apparent adaptation to local and temporary circumstances, tends to a variety of important moral results; awakening attention, stimulating curiosity, promoting research, rewarding diligence, humility, reverence, and conducing to the growth and strength not of mere belief, but of a genuine religious faith²." If, we may ask, the Bible has the character mistak-

¹ See Hawkins, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 45-48.

² Hawkins, *l. c.* p. 63.

only ascribed to it,—if it be true that “all those things which concern the terms of man’s salvation are delivered with the greatest evidence and perspicuity¹,” how are we to account for the diversity of doubts, errors, and disputes that have arisen respecting the meaning of particular passages, and what need was there for the careful provision made by apostles for a succession of teachers who might give continuous oral instruction in every Church? In every instance where the Gospel was planted, a society was also established; teachers were appointed, and ministers of the Word whose express function was *to give attendance to reading, exhortation, doctrine, to preach the Word, to be apt to teach, to labour in the Word and doctrine, to be ministers of the new covenant, ministers of the Gospel*². It is surely needless to enlarge on this point. The doctrine that “the Bible only is the religion of Protestants” is based on a fundamental misconception of the nature of Holy Writ, nor does it make any allowance for the ignorance, carelessness, prejudice, passion, defective reasoning powers

¹ Stillingfleet, quoted by Hawkins, l. c. p. 322.

² Hawkins, l. c. p. 42.

and party spirit of men. An apostolic writer reminds his readers that in S. Paul's epistles there are *some things hard to be understood which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction*¹. Indeed, as S. Vincent very justly says, "The Holy Scripture owing to its very depth is not understood of all men in one and the same sense; its expressions are interpreted by different men in different ways, so that it seems as if almost as many opinions might be extracted from it as there are men"². It is indeed a strange zeal for Scripture that would reject in the search after truth the aid of the Church of Christ. Experience conclusively shows that the student of the Bible needs a clue to guide him if he is to be saved from falling into fantastic errors, if he is not to lose all sense of proportion. This clue is supplied by the "hermeneutical tradition" of the Church. "It is necessary," S. Vincent elsewhere says³, "that the faculty of understanding the heavenly Scripture should be

¹ 2 Pet. iii. 16.

² *Common. c. 2.* Father Clarke's pamphlet, already referred to, deals at length with the position implied in Chillingworth's aphorism, in chap. 2, "Popular Bible-reading and common sense." Cp. Hawkins, *ut supra*.

³ *Common. c. 29.*

directed by the one rule of the ecclesiastical sense, especially in those inquiries on which the foundations of Catholic dogma rest for support." So S. Cyril of Jerusalem instructs his catechumens: "Receive through teaching and authoritative instruction, and hold fast, the one only faith now delivered unto thee by the Church and confirmed by the testimony of the entire Scripture. For since all cannot read the Scriptures, and some are debarred by ignorance, and some by want of leisure, from knowledge of them, lest the soul should perish through ignorance, the clauses in which we comprehend the doctrine of the faith are few in number. . . . For not as it seized the fancy of men were the statements of the Creed compiled, but the most salient points collected from the whole of Scripture make up the doctrine of the faith. Like a grain of mustard-seed this faith in a few sentences has embraced the whole knowledge of godliness contained in the Old and New Testaments. Take heed then and hold fast the traditions which ye are now receiving¹."

¹ *Catech.* v. 12.

IV.

Enough has been said to illustrate the relation in which Scripture stands to the doctrinal and hermeneutical tradition of the Church, and the limits of our present subject have now been reached. It may be well, in conclusion, again to impress upon our minds how limited is the area within which we can be said to possess primary authority, i.e. the testimony of the Bible corroborating that of the Church. The central doctrines of the revealed faith are few in number, though they are great and august in proportion to their fewness. They constitute that solid body of truth which the great mass of Christians hold in common. Such a doctrine is that of our Lord's Divinity—a doctrine received and taught not here or there only, not in this age only or in that, but in "East and West, North and South, throughout all Christendom in every Church, so far as the records of Christianity extend¹". And it need scarcely be pointed out how impressive is the strength of this consentient testimony. Here at least is one of those truths as to which no man can say that Christendom

¹ Hawkins, l. c. p. 115.

speaks with a divided voice. Then again, outside the range of such central verities as are contained in the Creeds of the Church, lies a department of truth in regard to which it may be said that there is a very strong consensus of Catholic opinion rather than any definite dogma of the Church¹. Again, there are some subjects in regard to which a certain latitude of opinion has always prevailed, owing to the lack of precise scriptural statements or definitions of the Church². Finally, there are doctrines put forward which not only lack all scriptural warrant but are demonstrably novel; and in regard to these we shall adhere to the rule of S. Vincent, receiving and believing only that which we have ascertained the Catholic Church to have universally held in ancient times³.

On the whole, then, we are encouraged to put ourselves under the guidance of the Church so far as it extends; and we must

¹ e.g. the doctrines of the eucharistic presence and sacrifice, or of the Christian ministry. See Gore, *Roman Claims*, pp. 69, 70.

² e.g. the nature of the gift received by the faithless communicant, the actual sinlessness, or the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin.

³ *Common. c.* 20.

be careful not to exaggerate the diversities of teaching which prevail within particular portions of the Church. We do well to endeavour to deepen our sense and practical comprehension of those holy verities which with one mouth and one heart Christendom proclaims: the mystery of the Trinity in Unity, the Incarnation of the Son of God, the atoning sacrifice of the Saviour, the work of the Spirit, the one baptism, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, the judgement. By meditation on these revealed mysteries of the faith, we shall at once educate our sense of proportion, and escape from the maze of fruitless controversy, walking steadily and soberly in the revealed paths of peace. Finally, we shall learn to trust practically to that *unction from the Holy One* which rests on Christians; we shall believe that if in anything we be otherwise minded than our brethren *God shall reveal even this* to us¹, unveiling to us as we are able to bear it the inexhaustible significance of our holy faith, and illuminating for us the Scriptures which enshrine it. "For we have a Lord," S. Chrysostom says, "who loves mankind, and when He sees us anxious,

¹ Phil. iii. 15.

and strongly desirous of understanding the Divine oracles, He doth not leave us destitute of ought besides, but straightway enlightens our understanding, and bestows that illumination that proceeds from Himself, and according to His benign wisdom communicates all true doctrine to our souls¹". Yes, the means which God has placed within our reach for the attainment of truth are all to be used in combination: we are to hear the Church, and then to diligently search the Scriptures for proof of what she teaches; but above all we are to remember that God will give the *Holy Spirit to them that ask Him*. *We have received*, S. Paul says, *not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Ye have an anointing from the Holy One, writes S. John, and ye know all things; . . . and as for you, the anointing which ye received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you. But as His anointing teacheth you concerning all things, and is true and is no lie, and even as it taught you, abide ye in Him*².

¹ *Opera*, tom. iv, p. 216.

² S. Luke xi. 13; 1 Cor. ii. 12; 1 John ii. 20, 27 (marg.).

NOTE A.

To the Church the Scriptures belong, etc.

Tertullian, *de praescr. Haer.* xix: "Our appeal must not be made to the Scriptures; nor must controversy be admitted on points in which victory will either be impossible or uncertain, or not certain enough. . . . The natural order of things would require that this point should be first raised, 'To whom does the faith itself properly belong? Whose are the Scriptures? From whom, and through whom, and when, and to whom has been handed down that rule by which men become Christians?' For wherever it shall be made manifest that the true Christian rule and faith exists, there will likewise be the true Scriptures and expositions thereof, and all the Christian traditions."

Augustine, *de moribus Eccl.* lxi, speaks of the Scriptures as "at all times most widely diffused, and guarded by the testimony of the Churches dispersed abroad throughout the whole world." In determining the contents of the Canon, he elsewhere says, "we must follow the authority of the greatest available number of Churches, especially that of Apostolic Sees."

With regard to the actual Canon of Scripture and its contents, see the account given by Bp. Westcott in *The Bible and the Church*. The enlarged Canon adopted by the Synod of Trent includes the apocryphal Books of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, the two Books of Maccabees, and the Book of Baruch; the Synod, in the main, follows the Third Council of Carthage (397 A.D.), which, without doubt, was largely influenced by the authority of S. Augustine. The reasons, however, why his authority on this point is not for a moment to be weighed against the testimony of the four preceding

centuries are overwhelmingly strong, but cannot be discussed here.

We receive the Canon on the authority of the Church, and we may observe, "It is no vicious circle to say that Holy Scripture proves the existence of the Church, and that this, the Church, proves Holy Scripture. An ambassador comes to a king bearing his credentials in a letter. He himself is the authority for the genuineness of the letter: when the letter is opened, it is found to define the powers, plenipotentiary or other, of the messenger who brought it. Thus it is with Holy Scripture" (Bp. Forbes, *Explanation of the XXXIX Articles*, p. 93). The same illustration is given by Dr. Wiseman, *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*, vol. i, lect. 3.

It has sometimes been contended that a passage of S. Basil (*de Spir. Sancto*, c. lxvi.) recognizes the equal authority of unwritten tradition and Scripture. But (1) the illustrations given by Basil are all taken from points of *practice, usage, and discipline*, the word *δόγματα* evidently meaning ordinances and usages, not doctrines. (2) S. Basil himself expressly teaches elsewhere that in matters of faith the appeal to Scripture is the ultimate test or criterion. Thus he says, "It is a manifest defection from the faith, and a proof of arrogance, either to reject anything of what is written, or to introduce anything that is not" (*de Fide*, c. i.); and again, "Believe those things which are written; the things which are not written seek not" (*Hom. xxix. adv. calumn. S. Trin.*). To these may be added a passage from the *de Spiritu Sancto* itself, c. xvi. S. Basil is speaking of the co-equal honour and glory due to the Father and the Son, as a point taught by "the Fathers." He continues: "But this is not sufficient for us, that it is the tradition of the Fathers. For even they followed the mind (*βουλήματι*) of the Scripture, taking their first principles (or premisses) from the passages which a short while ago we set before you from Scripture."

NOTE B.

On tradition as a rule of usages and rites, see Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, part iii, ch. 4. The "tradition" is in fact threefold: (a) A rule of faith and doctrine, such as the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, the doctrine of grace, etc. These and other doctrines, which are taught by the Church and corroborated by Scripture, are therefore *de fide*. (b) A rule of interpretation (hermeneutical tradition). (c) A rule respecting rites and ceremonies. Tertullian, *de cor. Mil.* iii, mentions certain ceremonies in baptism, times of receiving the Holy Communion, the observance of Sunday, and the use of the sign of the cross, as instances of traditional usages. S. Basil of Caesarea, in the passage *de Spir. Sancto*, c. lxvi, ascribes to tradition the words of invocation (ἐπίκλησις) used before the consecration of the elements. The freedom recognized by our Thirty-fourth Article is admirably illustrated by the injunction given by Pope Gregory the Great to Augustine: "Ex singulis ergo quibusque ecclesiis, quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta sunt elige, et haec quasi in fasciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes in consuetudinem deponere" (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 27, quoted by Maclear, *Introduction to the Articles*, p. 383, note 2). See generally Hawkins' *Bampton Lectures*, No. 5.

NOTE C.

Roman Catholic lay-people and Scripture.

M. Lasserre says: "The greater part of the children of the Church only know fragments of the sacred volume, reproduced in no logical or chronological order in prayer-books and in the Mass for Sundays and feasts; and they scarcely retain anything from it except special

quotations which are met with more often than others in sermons and pious books, and end by taking possession, whether they wish it or not, of the memory of all, and so to say become public property" (*Preface*, p. ii). Cp. Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, pp. 10 and 11.

A defence of the great restrictions under which lay-people are allowed to read Scripture is given by Father Clarke in his pamphlet *The Pope and the Bible*, chap. 2.

XII.

IV.

THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL
COUNCILS.

No. XII.

The Church Historical Society.

President:—THE RT. REVEREND M. CREIGHTON, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

The Authority of General Councils (IV).

BY THE

REV. W. E. COLLINS, M.A.,

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AT KING'S COLLEGE,
LONDON.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

LONDON:

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,

NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.; 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.

BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.

NEW YORK: E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.

1896.

SUMMARY.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY.—Collective action in the Church	145
I. Exemplified in the Apostolic Gathering at Jerusalem	148
II. Growth of the Synodic System	151
III. Constantine and the Church. The Council of Arles	157
IV. The Council of Nicaea	162
V. General Councils—how regarded by the later Fathers	171
VI. What constitutes a General Council	176
VII. The Catholic Church the final test of the ecumenicity of Councils	183
VIII. Certain untenable positions	187
APPENDIX	195

THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

Συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—1 Cor. v. 4.

TO-DAY, then, we start from the position that the bishops are the *normal* organ of the Church's teaching power. Not that they are the sole organ, for the whole Church, clergy and laity alike, and all our work and all our worship should be one great united voice of the faith. But the bishops are the *normal*, regular organ of the Church's voice¹; it is they who are commissioned to strike the chord to which the whole body is to respond. And this in itself is a thing of no small importance for our own day, be it observed, seeing that some people seem to be under the impression that the real function of the bishop—the ἐπίσκοπος—is to shut his eyes

¹ Cf. the preamble to the Creed of Eusebius in Socr. *H. E.* i. 8 καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων κ.τ.λ.

and stop his ears to anything which he cannot approve.

We have been led to our position by the study of the actual practice of the Church of the Fathers. And indeed, whatever attempts may have been made in later days to minimise this function of the bishop, either by the setting up of an infallible oracle, or by the abolition of a teaching authority altogether, there can be no question that from the second century onwards (to use Dr. Hatch's words) "the bishop was conceived as having what S. Irenaeus calls the *charisma veritatis* (the sure gift of the truth); the bishop's seat was conceived as being, what S. Augustine calls it, the *cathedra unitatis* (the seat of unity); and round the episcopal office revolved the whole vast system, not only of Christian administration and Christian organization, but also of Christian doctrine¹."

¹ Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 98 f. The Eastern view is given, e.g. in the Confession of Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, read at the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672, where, in *Decr.* x, amongst other functions of the bishop we are told that "καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν εὐαγγέλιον διδάσκει καὶ τῆς εὐσεβοῦς ὑπερμαχεῖ πίστεως" (ap. Kimmell, *Monum. Fidei Eccl. Orient.* vol. I, p. 442). For the Roman view see, e.g. *Canones et Decr. Conc. Trid.* Sess. v. cap. 2; Sess. xxiv. cap. 4; Melchior

But seeing that, as we have already ascertained in a previous lecture¹, all teaching authority is ultimately of the nature of witness, it follows that the single bishop, speaking in the name of the Church, may fail, through prejudice or ignorance, or want of philosophic grasp, to express the true mind of the Church; for nobody has yet ventured to suggest that every bishop is infallible. In such a case it is obvious that it pertains to other bishops to set him right. And indeed, in general, collective action, rather than individual, is to be looked for, in matters which concern the faith, that out of the mouths of many witnesses every word may be established. For the guardianship of the faith is committed to the bishops, not individually only, but collectively². "For we have," writes Bossuet, "two means of arriving at the knowledge of Catholic truth: the first, by the consent

Canus, *De Locis Theologicis*, v. 5 (Migne, *Cursus*, vol. I, p. 289); Regnier, *De Eccl. Christi*, Pars II, sect. i, argum. 5 (ib. III. 984). That it is difficult really to reconcile this with the modern Roman dogma goes without saying. See also Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ*, Part II, chap. iv, sect. 5.

¹ See *The Teaching Power of the Church*, No. X. of the Church Historical Society's publications.

² According to the famous, but hardly translateable, passage of S. Cyprian,—"*Episcopatus unus est, cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*" (*De Cath. Eccl. Unit.* § 5).

of the Church at large; the second, by the Church assembled in ecumenical or general councils¹." In other words, there is a *magisterium* of the *Ecclesia congregata*; and it is this which we have to consider.

I.

We have, most providentially, an account preserved to us in Holy Scripture of such combined action of the Church. The matter with which it was concerned might perhaps be described rather as one of discipline than as one of doctrine; but that does not matter for our purpose². A difficulty had arisen at Antioch owing to certain from Judaea, who taught the Gentile Christians there that circumcision was essential. This

¹ *Def. Decl. Cler. Gallic.* lib. vii. c. 1.

² Acts xv. The question of the faith—whether Gentiles could be admitted to the Church—had already been decided on the lines of divine revelation (Acts xi. 1-18). It was now to be settled what laws were binding upon Gentile Christians—whether or not they were to observe the Jewish Law. Cf. Ramsay, *S. Paul the Traveller*, p. 157: "The question, it must be clearly observed, was not whether non-Jews could be saved, for it was admitted by all parties that they could, but how they were saved: did the path of belief lie through the gate of the Law alone, or was there a path of belief that did not lead through that gate?"

naturally produced "no small dissension;" and ultimately it was decided to send delegates (Paul and Barnabas) to Jerusalem, in order to refer the question to the apostles and the elders there. They were received with joy by the Church; and, as the question still urgently needed settlement, "the apostles and the elders came together for to consider the matter," the conference being held before the whole Church. The matter was brought forward, and freely discussed, there being, as we read, much questioning (or investigation)¹. At length (after others had expressed their views) the leading apostles spoke—Peter on the question of principle, then the delegates upon the facts, and lastly, James sums up the whole matter, apparently as president, by virtue of his position at the head of the Church at Jerusalem², and proposes a definite course of action; and this course is accepted by "the apostles and the elders, with the whole Church." An agreement having been arrived at, it is embodied in a letter, written by the

¹ Πολλῆς ζητήσεως (verse 7).

² So S. Chrysostom (Cramer, *in loc.*). See the account of the Conference in Ramsay, *S. Paul the Traveller*, chap. vii, and Baumgarten, *Apostolic History*, sect. xxiv. (vol. II, p. 13 f). For the position of S. James, see Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 12; but cf. Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, p. 199.

officers of the Church, "the apostles and the elders¹," and affirming without doubt that their decision has the approval of the Holy Ghost. This letter is forthwith taken to Antioch by Paul and Barnabas, and two delegates from the Church at Jerusalem, and delivered to the Church there, being received with joy. Thence, we read, the decrees that were ordained by the apostles and elders at Jerusalem² are taken by Paul and Barnabas to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia, and given to them "for to keep." And, although a party of Judaisers existed for generations more, the matter, so far as the Church is concerned, is at an end³.

¹ This is undoubtedly the meaning; and the word ἀδελφοῖς may not improbably be a corruption.

² Τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις (Acts xvi. 4).

³ Roman writers have strangely exaggerated the naturally important position of S. Peter at this assembly into that of the president of a council, e.g. Bossuet, *Def. Decl. Cler. Gallic.* vii. 6: "Pierre entama la délibération, et dit le premier son avis; ce qui, dans la suite, a établi l'usage que les présidents des conciles ouvrirent les premiers leurs avis et que les décrets fussent conclus en premier lieu par leur autorité" (I quote from a French version of 1845). And Ballerini, *De potestate Summorum Pontificum et Conciliorum Generalium*, ii. § 1 (Migne, *Cursus*, vol. III, p. 1289): "In ea S. Petrus primus omnium sententiam tulit; alii autem omnes eamdem amplexi, unam cum eo definitionem

Now it is quite true that there are differences between this apostolic gathering at Jerusalem and the councils of later days. But for my present purpose it is enough to notice what is common to both, viz. the principle that when dissensions arise owing to the action of single teachers, they are to be met and put an end to by means of the combined action of the Church. So long as there is no discordant utterance, the common witness of the Church is enough; but when discord arises, the Church may have to resort to combined action. And upon the working out of this principle is based the whole synodic system.

II.

It grew comparatively slowly. Mutual action and co-operation was of course common from the first, but it only became conscious and formal as the result of a realized want. As there is no complete resemblance, so there is no direct historical connexion between the Jerusalem assembly and the later councils. None the less, these are exemplifications of the

edidère. Idem dicendum de Romanis pontificibus, qui eadem, qua Petrus, definiendi potestate atque auctoritate fruuntur."

same principle. They are the logical and inevitable result of the existence of any organization at all, and of the fact that Church authority is based on witness. And to those who remember that the Canon of Holy Scripture rests upon no synodic utterance¹, but rather upon the consensus of the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as shown in history, it will be an enhancement of the value of synodic action to remember that it rests upon a like basis.

As we should have expected, the earliest recorded instances of co-operation between bishops have to do with important matters of Church order. Letters of commendation, excommunications, and the like, imply common action, or they would in practice become nugatory. In fact, there is much to suggest that the meetings between bishops to consider such matters were the origin of regular synods of the bishops of a district².

¹ Of course our present canon is virtually the same as that of the Council of Carthage in 397; that council, however, did not *make* the canon, but declared and recognized what was already in use. See Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, pp. 180-188.

² Cf. Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 283: "My belief is that it was the review of excommunications for ratification or rejection which constituted the chief

However that may be, there is clear evidence that assemblies of this kind were held as early as the second century¹, and that their canons or decisions came to be regarded as having the force of law in the Church². And they are mentioned by Firmilian, Bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea in the early part of the third century, as a regular annual thing: "Therefore it has become necessary that every year we elders and rulers should assemble to put in order what has been committed to our charge, that if there are matters of graver import, they may be regulated by common counsel³." And little over a century later, Eusebius speaks of them as essential. Here are his words: "The emperor [Licinius] made a law that the bishops should never on any account

business of the councils of neighbouring bishops, which we know to have met periodically in very early times."

¹ Haddan (*Dict. Chr. Ant.* vol. I, p. 473) dates their origin from the latter half of the second century. Tertullian (*De Pudic.* x.) says that the Shepherd of Hermas was always judged by every council of Churches to be false.

² This was doubtless a very gradual process. The individual bishop had a freedom of action which could not lightly be hampered. Cf. *S. Cypr. Ep.* lv. § 17; lxxii. § 3.

³ *S. Cypr. Ep.* lxxv. 4 (ut si qua graviora sunt, communi consilio dirigantur).

communicate with one another, nor should any one of them absent himself on a visit to another Church, nor, lastly, should the holding of synods or councils for matters of common interest be allowed. Now this was clearly a pretext for displaying his malice against us; for we were compelled either to violate his law, and thus be subject to penalties, or else by obeying it to make void the laws of the Church, since it is impossible to settle important questions but by means of synods¹."

Now this implies that the importance of conciliar action had grown in two ways. (1) As we have already observed, the early councils seem to have been concerned mainly, or entirely, with disciplinary matters. But already by the time of Tertullian it could be said that in them "all the deeper questions are dealt with for the common good²." And in the course of the second and third centuries, bishops³, such as Beryllus of Bostra and Paul of Samosata, were tried for heresy and deposed, and

¹ Eus. *Vit. Const.* i. 51.

² Tert. *De Ieiuniis*, c. 13, "per quae et altiora quaeque in commune tractantur."

³ Eus. *H. E.* vi. 33; vii. 27-30.

heresies¹, such as Montanism, were examined and condemned, for the security of the faith. (2) And secondly, the councils were often no longer small and local gatherings, but included considerable numbers of bishops, and these often of the greatest importance. Tertullian, in the passage above referred to, speaks of the councils in the East as being gathered “*ex universis ecclesiis*”²; which must imply some considerable magnitude. The synod which met at Rome to judge Novatian was “very great,” consisting of sixty bishops³. The three councils which met at Antioch some years later to try Paul were perhaps smaller, but the bishops were far more important and came from all parts. “All the rulers of the Churches from all directions” came to Antioch, from Syria and Cappadocia and Pontus; and the great Dionysius of Alexandria was only prevented from coming by age and illness⁴. Two synods assembled by S. Cyprian, at Carthage in 256, contained respectively seventy-one and eighty-seven bishops, and great numbers of

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* v. 16, 24.

² His expression, “*per Graecias*,” would seem to imply that such councils were not known in the West, or at least in Africa.

³ Eus. *H. E.* v. 24.

⁴ Ibid. vii. 27, 28.

priests and deacons, "a great part of the laity being also present."

Two things are to be observed with regard to the authority attributed to these synods¹. (1) They claimed, like the individual teacher, to speak in the name of the whole Church, and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Thus, for instance, the letter of the Council of Antioch which deposed Paul of Samosata was addressed "to all our fellow-ministers throughout the world, bishops, priests, and deacons, and to the whole Catholic Church under heaven;" and it declares that they have been compelled to excommunicate Paul, and "to appoint in his place another bishop of the Catholic Church²." And "at the suggestion of the Holy Ghost," or a similar phrase, is frequently prefixed to the decrees of even the earliest councils³. (2) And secondly, although each council claims to speak with the voice of the

¹ On both points see Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, II. ii. § 25 (vol. I, p. 308 f.). He points out that 'grundsätzlich ist jede Synode ein allgemeines Koncil,' so that the size of a council makes no difference in its nature. For the essential thing in every case is reception and ratification by the Church (Ib. pp. 314 f., 317, 327).

² Eus. *H. E.* vii. 30.

³ e.g. Carthage (252), and Arles (314). Other examples are given in Sohm, *op. cit.* vol. I, p. 310 f.

whole Church, and although its decisions are addressed to the whole Church, there is no certainty that they will be accepted by it. Elsewhere, councils proceed to discuss and pass canons upon the same subjects, and sometimes in a contrary sense, as for instance when the Churches of Italy and Africa are making canons about heretical baptism. In such a case "the extent to which a synod succeeds in enforcing its decisions depends upon the extent to which it obtains *de facto* recognition¹." For even the area covered by the jurisdiction of a particular synod does not seem to be *definitely* settled till the earlier half of the fourth century².

III.

But the next great stage in the history of councils must be traced rather more at length. It occurred after the close of the great persecution of Diocletian (so-called), when the Edict of Milan had restored peace to the Churches. Constantine, although certainly not yet a Christian—it was only very

¹ A. Robertson, *Athanasius* (Nicene and Post-Nicene Library,) p. lxxv.

² By the Fifth Canon of Nicaea; and even this was not observed for at any rate a generation or two.

gradually that he accepted the Christian creed, and he was only baptized on his death-bed—was yet profoundly impressed with the grand monotheism of the Christian faith and the unity of the Church, and hoped great things from her as an agent in social reforms. Accordingly he took a keen interest in her welfare; and above all, realizing that her power as an agent for the reform of the empire depended upon her internal unity, he spared no pains to put an end to her discords. Accordingly, when the African Donatists appealed to him to decide their dispute with the Catholic Church, the emperor at once accepted the office¹. In a letter to Melchiades, the Bishop of Imperial Rome, he deploras the fact that the people have followed “the baser course” of disunion, and directs that the matter shall be tried in the presence of the Bishops of Rome, Autun, Cologne, and Arles. For, says the emperor, “I have such reverence for the legalised Catholic Church

¹ He followed the precedent of the Emperor Aurelian, who, being appealed to when the heretical Paul of Samosata refused to give up the church buildings at Antioch, “ordered that they should be given to those to whom the bishops of Italy and of Rome should adjudge them” (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 30).

that I do not wish you to leave schism or division in any place¹."

A council was accordingly held, fifteen Italian bishops being present in addition to the four mentioned by Constantine. The council decided against the Donatists, and their leader was condemned². Donatus and his followers attempted an appeal to the emperor, but were sternly rebuked for behaving "like the heathen³." They continued to complain: but Constantine only referred them to the decision of the synod. As, however, from his point of view peace was before all else necessary, he at length gave way to their importunity, in the hope that the decision of a yet larger assembly might compel unanimity. He therefore wrote letters to the bishops throughout his dominions (i.e. the Western Empire), in which, after narrating the circumstances, he goes on:

¹ Eus. *H. E.* x. 5 τὸσαύτην με αἰδῶ τῇ ἐνθέσῳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπονέμειν, ὥς μηδὲν καθόλου σχίσμα ἢ διχοστασίαν ἐν τινι τόπῳ βούλεσθαι με ὑμᾶς καταλιπεῖν. I take ἐνθέσῳ to refer to the Edict of Toleration.

² S. Optatus, *De Schism. Donat.* i. 22 f. (ap. Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* vol. IV, p. 280 f.).

³ "O rabida furoris audacia: sicut in causis gentilium fieri solet, appellationem interposuerunt" (Optatus, ut supr.).

"Wherefore it seemed to me necessary to provide that this dissension, which ought to have ceased after judgement had been given by their own voluntary agreement [i.e. in a council summoned with their consent], should now, if possible, be brought to an end by the agreement of many." To this end he has directed "very many bishops from different places innumerable¹ to assemble together at Arles to try the matter." Accordingly each bishop to whom the letter comes² is authorized to procure a state carriage, and to take with him two others "of the second rank" (i.e. priests) and three servants³, and come to Arles. The council was accordingly held. We do not know for certain how many bishops were present; the synodic epistle is signed by thirty-three only, and by other persons⁴; but more may have been there, and

¹ Eus. *H. E.* x. 5 πλείστους ἐκ διαφόρων καὶ ἀμυθήτων τόπων ἐπισκόπους.

² The letter given by Eusebius is addressed to Chrestus Bishop of Syracuse; but it is doubtless in substance that which was sent to every bishop.

³ Δίο . . . ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου θρόνου . . . καὶ τρεῖς παῖδας τοῖς δυνησομένοις ὑμῖν κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν. Is it possible that this is a mistake of the quaestor who drew up the letter, and that three *διάκονοι* were intended?

⁴ Also by fifteen presbyters, twenty-five deacons, two readers, and seven exorcists.

indeed in the later traditions the number has grown to six hundred. But never had any synod been so representative as this—bishops were there from Aquileia, and Capua, and Milan, from Treves, and Cologne, and Rheims, not to speak of Emerita in Spain, Carthage, and three bishops from Britain. It represented the whole West as no synod had ever done before.

Some ten years later the rise of the Arian heresy in Egypt once more called out Constantine's energies. Alexander the Pope of Alexandria had already made attempts to put it down, but without much effect: and it came to the knowledge of the emperor. So as soon as, by the defeat of Licinius, he had become lord of the whole empire, he wrote a letter to Alexander and Arius, exhorting them to come to some agreement about a matter which is really of little moment¹, and upon which indeed they are really at one². And his object in all this is, he says, "first, to bring the diverse judgments of all nations respecting the Deity to a state of settled uniformity; and secondly, to restore to health the system of the world"³.

¹ Eus. *Vit. Const.* ii. 71.

² *Ibid.* c. 70.

³ *Ibid.* c. 65.

But the evil was greater, as Eusebius says, than could be overcome by a single epistle¹; and as there were other questions causing differences in the Church at this time, Constantine resorted again to his former plan, and summoned the bishops from all quarters (i.e. this time of the *whole* Church)² to meet at Nicaea, again providing that the expense of their journeys should be borne by the State. And thus then met the First General Council.

IV.

Now I have purposely given at some length the circumstances which led to the calling of the Council of Nicaea, in order to make it clear that that council is not the working out of an idea that was *consciously* before the mind of the Church, but a new departure introduced from without. So far as I know, there is not a word to suggest that the idea had occurred to anybody before the beginning of the fourth century. It was the great Constantine who originated this plan for bringing all the bishops together, in order

¹ Eus. *Vit. Const.* ii. c. 73.

² Both Eusebius (*Vit. Const.* iii. 6) and Socrates (*H. E.* i. 8) call it *oikouμενικήν*.

that they might agree upon something, and so make an end of controversy. Arles and Nicaea alike had this as their aim: the former had failed because after all but half the world had been represented; Nicaea seemed, even to the emperor himself, to have succeeded. Here was an end of controversy. Accordingly, after the council he wrote to tell the Alexandrians that the bishops had met; that "we have received from Divine Providence the inestimable blessing of being delivered from all error, and united in the acknowledgement of one and the same faith;" and that "all points which seemed on account of ambiguity to furnish ground for debate have been considered and accurately examined¹."

I am not saying, of course, that no other had any voice in the matter. On the contrary, it is highly probable that his friend Hosius the Bishop of Cordova shared in his confidence. It is known that Hosius was the bearer of the emperor's letter to Alexander and Arius²; he has a better claim than any other bishop to be considered the President of the Council of Nicaea; and indeed Sulpitius Severus seems to imply that it was he who suggested

¹ Socr. *H. E.* i. 9.

² Ibid. *H. E.* i. 7.

the summoning of the council ¹. But there can I think be no question that the plan is Constantine's own. Nor should this surprise us; for such a thing had hardly been within the bounds of possibility until Constantine's accession, and even then would have been quite impossible without his co-operation. The suggestion then came from Constantine: but the thing itself produced the most profound impression upon the whole Church, and at once commended itself to the mind of the Church, as being the complete realization of that co-operation and fellowship which was of her very essence, and which had already found a partial exemplification in the local synods of earlier days. There was one change, indeed, and an important one: whereas, to Constantine's mind, the bishops were engaged upon settling the faith once for all, they realized, more or less clearly, that they were witnessing to the faith which had been delivered once for all. To sum up then, we must realize that "the conception of a General Council did not give rise to Nicaea, but *vice versa* ²." Here, as elsewhere, the facts pre-

¹ Sulp. Sev. *Hist.* ii. 40. 5: "Nicaena synodus auctore illo (Osio) confecta habebatur."

² A. Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. lxxv.

ceded the theory, and the theory was based upon already existing facts.

It would be hard to exaggerate the impression of awe and reverence produced upon the Christian imagination by the Council of Nicaea—and this in spite of some facts which might have had a contrary effect. Eusebius¹, for instance, tells us that it was a scene of violent controversy; and Socrates² adds that the emperor gave the bishops an object-lesson in forgiveness by destroying the written charges which some of them had handed in against one another. None the less, Eusebius himself, and others who were actually present, were deeply moved by it, and realized that “the proceeding was the work of God³.” And he goes on to speak of it thus⁴:—“The most distinguished of God’s ministers from all the Churches which abounded in Europe, Asia, and Africa were here present. And a single Church, as though dilated by God, sufficed to contain at once Syrians and Cilicians, Phoenicians and Arabians, representatives from Palestine and from Egypt; Thebans and Libyans, with the dwellers of Mesopotamia. A Persian bishop was

¹ Eus. *Vit. Const.* iii. 13.

² Soer. *H. E.* i. 9.

³ Eus. *Vit. Const.* iii. 6.

⁴ Ibid. iii. 7, 8.

present at the council, nor was even a Scythian found wanting, and the most celebrated of the Spaniards took his place among the rest. The prelate of the imperial city was prevented from attending by old age; but his presbyters were present and supplied his place. Constantine is the first prince who has bound together such a garland as this with the ligature of peace, and presented it to his Saviour thus exhibiting in our own times a similitude of the apostolic company. For it is told us that in the Apostles' age there were gathered 'devout men from every nation under heaven.' But that assembly was less, in that all who composed it were not ministers of God; but in the present company the number of bishops exceeded two hundred and fifty¹, whilst that of presbyters and deacons in their train, and the crowd of acolytes and other attendants, was quite beyond counting." Nor does Eusebius by any means stand alone. S. Atha-

¹ The number is elsewhere stated by Eustathius as over 270 (*Theodoret, H. E. i. 8*); by Constantine (*Soer. H. E. i. 9*) and S. Athanasius (*de Decr. 3*) as over 300; and by Socrates (*H. E. i. 8*), S. Gregory of Nazianzus (*Orat. xxi. 14*), and others as 318. S. Athanasius gives the number variously in different passages.

nasius¹ and every writer of the period refers to it with the greatest possible respect; and however much Arians might try to get behind its decision, they did not attempt for many years to repudiate it, so far as I am aware. This however was largely owing to their fear of Constantine. And if we had to judge from one fact alone, the very continuance of the Arian controversy subsequent to the Council of Nicaea is enough to show that no such ideas of the finality of a General Council as are now current were then held in the Church². Any suggestion that a council constituted in a particular manner must *ipso facto* decide rightly would have been scouted not only by Arius but by Athanasius himself³. Let us then try to estimate the authority which was attributed to the council in the century in which it was held.

To begin with, the council itself claimed to speak in the name of the whole Church, just

¹ S. Athanasius calls it the Ecumenical Council (*ad Ep. Aegypti*, § 5), the Great Council (*de Decr.* § 26), and the Ancient Council (*de Synodis*, § 20), as contrasted with the modern Arian councils.

² Cf. Sohm, *op. cit.* vol. I, p. 330 f.

³ Cf. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, 50 n: "his writings (i.e. of Athanasius) give us no trace of the theory of conciliar infallibility."

as earlier local ones had done, and with the full conviction that God had guided it¹. And the decisions of a council of such great size were naturally accepted with more reverence, and over a far larger area, than those of earlier local councils. But many facts can be adduced to show that this range had its limits. Thus the orthodox S. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catecheses*, written some twenty-three years after the council, never so much as mentions its creed by name; and only refers to it once in a rather disparaging way². More significant still, even when we bear in mind how few Western bishops were present at the Council³, is the fact that S. Hilary had never heard the Creed until just before his exile⁴, although this was thirty years after

¹ The emperor indeed, in his exaggerated reverence, attributes infallibility to it: "Even had they been unlearned men, yet as being illuminated by God, and the grace of the Holy Spirit (i.e. through their holy orders), they were utterly unable to err from the truth" (Socrates, *H. E.* i. 9).

² S. Cyr. Hieros. *Catech.* v. 12; cf. Gwatkin op. cit. p. 132.

³ "We can only trace seven bishops from the West; and in any case there cannot have been very many" (Gwatkin op. cit. p. 36, note 2).

⁴ S. Hil. *de Synodis*, p. 395 (*Ed.* Paris, 1652): "regeneratus pridem et in episcopatu aliquantis per manens, fidem Nicæam nunquam nisi exulaturus audivi." Hilary was consecrated Bishop of Poitiers in 353, and exiled about 356.

the council, and he had then been a bishop for some time.

More instructive still is it to notice S. Athanasius's attitude towards the council. He thankfully recognizes that it has been guided aright in its decisions: but had it decided otherwise he would have been the first to blame it for so doing¹. Its merit in his eyes is that it did not decide anything new, but simply stated what was already the faith of the Church. "They wrote concerning Easter, 'It seemed good as follows'; for it did then seem good that there should be a general compliance; but about the faith they wrote not 'It seemed good,' but 'Thus believes the Catholic Church'; and thereupon they confessed how they believed, in order to show that their own sentiments were not novel but apostolical²." And therefore it is, not on account of any inherent authority of the council itself, that he wrote of the Arians³, "Had they believed aright, they would have been satisfied with the confession put forth at Nicaea by the whole ecumenical

¹ He actually does express disapproval on one point (*Apol. c. Arianos*, § 71). For Athanasius's whole attitude towards the council see Gwatkin *op. cit.* p. 50, note 3, and Robertson's *Athanasius*, pp. lxxv. lxxvi.

² *de Synodis*, § 5.

³ *ad Episc. Aegypti*, § 5.

synod." "Vainly," he writes again, "do they run about with the pretext that they demanded councils for the faith's sake: for Divine Scripture is sufficient above all things; but if a council be needed on the point, there are the proceedings of the Fathers: for the Nicene bishops did not neglect this matter, but stated the doctrine so exactly, that persons reading their words honestly, cannot but be reminded by them of the religion towards Christ announced in the Divine Scriptures¹." It is only because they "preserve the teaching of the Fathers" that the bishops at Nicaea are said to have "done all that was needful for the Catholic Church²." If in one passage he speaks of "contending against an Ecumenical Council" as equivalent to "disobedience to fathers³," he balances it by another, showing that Nicaea is not to be preferred before the earlier synod of Antioch, or *vice versa*; since both alike did nothing new, but fell back upon the words of those who went before them⁴. And if we turn from the majestic freedom of the Eastern theologian to the more logical and formal precision of Italy (for such it has

¹ *de Synodis*, § 6.

² *Ib.* § 9.

³ *Ib.* § 33.

⁴ *Ib.* § 46.

always been), Julius of Rome accords with his brother-pope of Alexandria: he declares indeed that "a general council ought not to be set aside by a few individuals," but strongly upholds the power of one council to revise the decisions of another¹.

With the gradual extinction of the heresy, however, there came a change. As Arianism was proved to be false, on grounds of Scripture, reason, and history, men's minds turned with more and more of reverence to the great assembly which had laid down the lines so truly from the beginning. "To that council," writes S. Athanasius in 369, "the whole world has long ago agreed.... The word of the Lord which came through the Ecumenical Synod of Nicaea abides for ever²." The mind of the whole Church, in other words, had found rest in the decrees and creed of the council.

V.

And henceforth it was on all sides accepted that in such a council the Church spoke her mind with the fullest authority and weight.

¹ See Julius's letter in *Ath. Apol. c. Ar.*; especially §§ 22, 25.

² S. Ath. *ad Afros Ep. Synodica*, §§ 1, 2.

Some might still think it a necessary evil; and indeed it is obvious that it was a grievous interference with the work of the Church, and that but for human imperfections it would be unnecessary. Thus the letter of the bishops at Sardica speaks of the assembling of a great council as nothing less than a tempest (*procella*)¹. And S. Gregory of Nazianzus, whose pacific disposition and rather fastidious taste eminently unfitted him for them, and whose experiences of them were certainly unfortunate, declared, after the Council of Constantinople in 381, "If I must write the truth, I am disposed to avoid every assembly of bishops; for of no synod have I seen a profitable end, but rather an addition to than a diminution of evils; for the love of strife and the thirst for superiority are beyond

¹ S. Hilar. *Fragm.* iii. *ex op. hist.* p. 475 (*ed.* Paris, 1652): "Talem mundo tempestatis procellam induxerunt, ut orientem prope totum occidentemque turbarent, ut relinquentes singuli ecclesiasticas curas populosque Dei deferentes, atque ipsam Evangelii doctrinam postponentes, de longinquo adueniremus senes aetate graues, corpore debiles, aegritudine infirmi, trahebamurque per diuersa, nostrosque aegrotantes in itineribus deserebamus propter perpaucos scelestos olim digne damnatos, primatus ecclesiae contra fas appetentes . . . Omnis etenim fraternitas omnibus in prouinciis suspensa ac sollicita expectat in quem finem haec malorum procella succedat."

the power of words to express¹." But however much particular bishops may have disliked the necessity for General Councils, that necessity was felt universally; and in times of storm and stress they seemed the natural resource for the solution of difficult questions. And so Constantinople succeeded to Nicaea, and Ephesus to Constantinople, and Chalcedon to Ephesus, with a host of other assemblies between, which aspired to the same great name and authority.

For nobody in this age would have suggested for a moment that there was any other body in the Church which could even compare in authority with her bishops assembled in council. In the letter of Julius of Rome already referred to, he claims for himself a considerable personal authority, but he expressly bases it upon the canons, and never dreams of comparing it with the authority of the council². S. Ambrose, referring to the decrees of Nicaea, says, "Let us therefore keep the precepts of the elders, lest we should rashly break the hereditary

¹ S. Greg. Naz. *Epist.* cxxx. Procopio. The passage is discussed by Regnier (*De Eccl. Christi*, Pars I, sect. ii, cap. 6) and Salmon (*Infallibility of the Church*, pp. 297-301).

² See S. Ath. *Apol. c. Ar.*, especially §§ 25, 35; and cf. Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 17.

seals¹;" and elsewhere he declares that neither death nor the sword should separate him from the Nicene Council². When S. John Chrysostom was unlawfully expelled from his see, Innocent of Rome wrote to his clergy that a General Council was needed to put the matter right, and that he was considering how it might be obtained³; and he presently became a suitor to the emperors for this purpose, but in vain⁴. "Who does not know," writes S. Augustine, "that the very councils, whether of provinces or eparchies" (which, he has just said, have power to censure bishops), "themselves yield without any hesitation to the authority of plenary councils which are assembled out of the whole Christian world⁵?" Once more, to quote S. Vincent, men are to follow "the decrees of a General Council, if there be any; and if not, let them follow

¹ S. Ambr. *de Fide*, lib. iii. c. 15.

² Ibid. *Epist.* xxi.

³ Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. 26 καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς πολλὰ σκεπτόμεθα, δὲν τρόπον ἢ σύνοδος οἰκουμενικὴ συναχθείη, κ.τ.λ.

⁴ Ib. viii. 28.

⁵ S. Aug. *de Bapt.* ii. 4; cf. *Ep.* xliii. 19, and S. Ath. *ad Afros Ep. Synodica*, § 2: "the assembly at Nicaea is more than those at local synods, inasmuch as the whole is greater than the part."

what stands next; namely, the sentences of many and great doctors agreeing together¹."

Nor is there any material change for centuries afterwards. By the time of S. Leo the Papacy had grown greatly in its pretensions²: but none the less in a letter to Theodoret, after the Council of Chalcedon, he thanks God that "what He first defined by our ministry He had given force to (*firmavit*) by the unalterable assent of all the brethren, to show that what had been shaped by the first see of all, and had received the judgement of the whole Christian world, proceeded from Himself³." And a little while later we have language used which is yet more remarkable. The decrees of the councils had already one by one received the force of laws; but in 545 the Emperor Justinian not only re-affirmed this, but added the statement that he received the dogmas of these four councils as the Holy Scriptures⁴. And Pope Gregory the Great, to whom under God we owe so much of the conversion

¹ *Commonitorium*, c. xxvii.

² See, e.g. Langen, *Geschichte d. römischen Kirche*, vol. II, p. 104 f.; Hussey, *Rise of the Papal Power*, Lecture II.

³ S. Leo. *Ep.* cxx. ad Theodoritum; cf. *Ep.* lxxviii.

⁴ *Novell.* 131. 1; cf. *Cod. Justin.* I. i. 7.

of England, writes: "I confess that I receive and venerate, as the four books of the Gospel, so also the four councils . . . and the fifth council also I equally venerate¹." And it is impossible to avoid a smile when we find S. Isidore of Seville declaring that the reason why the Church before Constantine's time was so divided and rent asunder by heresies is that there was then no General Council².

VI.

So much with regard to the way in which General Councils were revered in the fourth and following centuries. But I have already pointed out that within this period there were several which aspired to the description but have not generally received it, as since then there have been many more. It therefore becomes necessary to inquire what assemblies are entitled to this august name.

(a) To begin with, it must be borne in mind that the name itself only gradually acquired fixity of use. For instance, S. Augustine speaks of the Council of Arles as a "plenary council of the whole Church," although, as

¹ S. Greg. Magn. *Epp.* lib. i, no. 25, ad Ioann. Const. Ep.; cf. lib. iv, no. 38. ad Theodelind.

² *ap.* Labbe, *Concilia*, vol. I, col. 5.

we saw, it included bishops from the West only¹. And other instances might be given of the same thing². (b) Then again, certain other councils to which the bishops from all parts were summoned, cannot lay claim to the title because of their paucity of numbers; e.g. that of Tyre in 335³. (c) Again, many councils, which, by their numbers, as well as by the fact of being summoned from the whole Church, might fairly claim to be admitted to the list, are excluded on one ground or another. Thus the Council of Sardica was quite as representative as Nicaea⁴, but has never been ranked as a General Council, largely because it issued no decree in matters of faith, and therefore has had no permanent value in the Church⁵. And the Council of Ariminum, which was considerably larger than any previous coun-

¹ S. Aug. *de Bapt.* ix. 14. It seems clear that he must mean Arles and not Nicaea, from the parallel passage in *Ep.* xliii. 19.

² E.g. the third Council of Toledo, in 627, calls itself "universalis" in Canon xviii. (where Bruns and other editors read *venerabilis*).

³ Eus. *Vit. Const.* iv. 40-42. It contained some sixty bishops, besides those from Egypt.

⁴ See the list of provinces represented, in Hefele, *History of Councils*, vol. II, p. 95.

⁵ Hefele, vol. I, p. 56; vol. II, pp. 172-6.

cil¹, actually betrayed the faith. (*d*) And once more, the Council of Constantinople in 381 was perhaps summoned only as an Eastern Council²; certainly only Eastern bishops were present³, and they to the number of one hundred and fifty only⁴; and yet it has always been accounted a General Council⁵.

This summary of facts might easily be amplified by extending it to the various assemblies of the fifth century: but what we have said will suffice to prove that the mere fact of bishops assembling in great numbers, or assembling from all parts of the world, is not enough to constitute such a council as will be *ipso facto* recognized by the whole Church; and *vice versa*, a council may be so recognized by the whole Church even though it be lacking in more of these points than one. Indeed, I think it would be quite true to say that there has

¹ "More than four hundred bishops were present" (S. Ath. *de Synodis*, c. 8).

² Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 6.

³ The most westerly name mentioned is that of Ascholi of Thessalonica.

⁴ So Gregory of Nazianzus.

⁵ It is so called by the synod which met at Constantinople the following year (Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 8).

never been a council which could really and strictly claim to represent the whole Church: at the best they have been but approximations. In some cases the West has been represented almost exclusively, in some cases the East; whilst since the schism of East and West it is of course obvious that no council could be held which should really represent the Church Catholic. And moreover, we must bear in mind that no such assembly could do more than represent the majority in the Church of the day; and it is the Church in her "length and breadth and depth and height" which is infallible.

And if the constitution of such a General Council has often been at fault, it must be acknowledged that its temper has often been very unjudicial¹. Even at the apostolic gathering at Jerusalem we seem to have an indication that the body of those present endeavoured to talk all at once². That there was much contention at Nicaea we have already observed. At Ephesus the disorder was far worse; the Egyptian bishops

¹ On this fact, and its explanation, see the wise words of Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. I, pp. 201-4.

² Acts xv. ἡ πολλῆς ζητήσεως γενομένης; verse 12 ἐσίγησε ἐκ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος.

brought the sailors of their ships with them, and Nestorius a crowd of followers too, whilst Memnon Bishop of Ephesus had gathered together a host of peasants from his farms: the result being that the Nestorians complained, and not without reason, of intimidation¹. And at Chalcedon things were not very much better. Nor have later days been by any means blameless. In the would-be General Council of Trent, when the subject of Justification was being discussed, so little was the interest shown by some of the fathers that Cardinal Pacheco found fault publicly with the persons who absented themselves throughout the debates, and then did not scruple to come and vote upon subjects of which they knew nothing². And on the other hand, in the course of the same discussions, one of the bishops flew into such a passion that he seized another by the beard, and did not leave go till he had torn out a large handful;—for which act, be it said, he was promptly turned out³. And even the latest Roman Council was by no

¹ See the *Acts* in Mansi, vol. IV.; and especially the letter of Nestorius and his fellows, coll. 1232-1236.

² Pallavicini, *Storia del Concilio di Trento*, viii. 8.

³ *Ib.* viii. 6. Cf. Froude, *Lectures on the Council of Trent*, p. 218.

means free from similar scenes of excitement¹. In truth, however, it is easy to make far too much of matters of this kind: only they may fairly be used to emphasize the fact that councils are far better fitted to be *witnesses* to the Faith than they would be to be *sources* of the Faith. In Dr. Salmon's words, "if they are entitled to less respect as judges, they are all the better witnesses²."

I have shown that it is impossible to define easily the *criteria* of a General Council, since some are refused for lack of numbers, some for lack of ecumenicity, some because they have given no decision concerning the faith, some because they have erred. Consequently it has been at all times debated whether any such *criteria* can be found. Our own Richard Field, for instance (who was Dean of Gloucester, 1610-16) declares, following earlier writers, that three conditions are necessary. "The first is, that the summons be general, and

¹ Manning, *True Story of the Vatican Council* (Nineteenth Century, vol. I, p. 608): "On two occasions the speaker tried the self-control of his audience beyond its strength. Strong and loud expressions of dissent were made, and a very visible resentment, at matter not undeserving of it, was expressed." The same thing has been stated much more strongly.

² Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 286.

such as may be known to all the principal parts and provinces of the Christian world. The second, that no bishop, whencesoever he come, be excluded, if he be known to be a bishop, and not excommunicate. The third, that the principal patriarchs be present with the concurrence of the particular synods under them, either in person, or by their substitutes or vicars¹." But it may well be doubted whether this definition would cover the First Council of Constantinople, to say nothing of the second: and we should at once have to enlarge it by allowing the subsequent ratification of an absent patriarch to serve instead of his presence, as Bellarmin does, at least in the case of the Bishop of Rome². The great Spanish theologian Melchior Canus, again, discusses whether a general summons is enough, or whether a general assembly is necessary likewise. Are we to account it general, for instance, if only ten bishops turn up, and they from Italy? (Or, we may add, only thirty or forty, as was the case during the earlier stages of the Council of Trent³?)

¹ Field, *Of the Church*, vol. IV, p. 12.

² Bellarmin, *de Conciliis et Ecclesia*, i. 12.

³ Froude, *Lectures on the Council of Trent*, pp. 173, 188. For further details see Philippon, *La Contre-Révolution*, pp. 306-309.

Or, on the other hand, if one bishop negligently stays away, does this prevent its being General? The conclusion that he comes to is, that both a general summons and a general assembly are necessary, and that in either case the consent of the whole Church is the sole and final judge¹.

VII.

And thus we are once more brought round to the consent of the whole Church as the final test of the ecumenicity of a council. I believe there is none other that can be given; and I am certain that there is none other which will satisfy every particular case. That is a General Council which is so accounted by the Church; and that which is not so accounted is not a General Council. With S. Gregory, we accept them because they are based upon universal consent². We look for the mind of the Church in them. With Dr. Field we

¹ Melchior Canus, *de Locis Theologicis*, v. 3 "Communi enim fidelium sensu agendum est, cum de rebus vobisque ecclesiae loquimur. . . . Nec satis est tamen ad generale concilium evocatio generalis, nisi sit etiam generalis congregatio. Sed ad generalem congregationem omnium episcoporum congregatio non requiritur."

² "Universali constituta consensu" (S. Greg. *Epp.* lib. i, no. 25).

hold that "General Councils are the best means for preserving of unity of doctrine, severity of discipline, and preventing of schisms, when they may be had; and though they be not absolutely necessary to the being of the Church, yet they are most behoveful for the best, readiest, and most gracious governing of the same; and howsoever there may be a kind of exercise of the supreme jurisdiction that is in the Church by the concurrence of particular synods, and the correspondence of several pastors, upon mutual intelligence of the sense, judgement, and resolution of every one of them, yet the highest and most excellent exercise of the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction is in General Councils¹." And we look forward to the time when the consent of the whole Church, as expressed in a council, shall confirm both peace and truth in the Church.

But, at the same time, we recognize with S. Augustine that General Councils may err, and the earlier be corrected by the later². With Waldensis we believe that not "that universal Church which is gathered together in a General Council" is infallible, since "we

¹ Field, *Of the Church*, vol. IV, pp. 5, 6.

² S. Aug. *de Bapt.* ii. 5.

have found these to have erred sometimes¹;" but "that Catholic Church which hath been dispersed throughout the whole world," and that faith which hath been held *ubique, semper, ab omnibus*. And therefore we affirm that at all times it is the duty of the faithful to "search the Scriptures daily, whether these things are so²." It is the duty of laity and clergy alike; for, as Field says, "the sheep of Christ, being reasonable, have and must have a kind of discerning whether they be directed into wholesome and pleasant pastures or not³." And it is a thing to rejoice in when an Athanasius stands up against a false General Council of Ariminium, and the English Church repudiates another at Trent, and some noble Bavarian theologians

¹ Waldensis, *Doctrinale Fidei*, lib. II, art. ii, cap. 19 (quoted in Field, *Of the Church*, vol. IV, p. 52). Cf. the speech of Cardinal D'Ailly at Constance: "According to some great doctors a General Council can err not only in deed but also in law, and, what is more, in faith; for it is only the universal Church which has the privilege that it cannot err in faith; according to that saying of Christ to Peter, not as regards himself nor his own personal faith, but as regards the faith of the universal Church, 'I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.'" (Quoted in Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy*, vol. I, p. 271.)

² Acts xvii. 11.

³ Field, vol. IV, p. 16.

and their followers, in our own day, reject a third at the Vatican.

Two things may be noticed, which follow from what has been said already: (1) There is a point of view from which it is often said that General Councils have *not* erred in matters of faith. And we believe indeed that the councils recognized by the English Church have not erred. But there is no real contradiction here of what is said in our Article of Religion, that General Councils have erred. For as Bishop Burnet long ago said, "The Article affirming that some General Councils have erred, must be understood of councils that pass for such¹." It is a mere question of words; and just as it may be said that "treason doth never prosper," for "when it prospers, none dare call it treason," so it may be said that General Councils do not err; for when they err, they are not recognized as general, by the true mind of the Church. (2) We must be prepared to find, and the fact is so, that different councils are recognized

¹ *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, No. xxi. (Oxford, 1796, p. 270). He goes on, "and that may be called General Councils, much better than many others that go by that name; for that at Arimini was both very numerous, and was drawn out of many different provinces."

as general in different parts of the Church. Thus the English Church has recognized six such councils (although sometimes mention has only been made of four¹); to these the Eastern Church adds two more²; whilst the Roman would more than double the number. Indeed, Roman Catholics do not agree among themselves as to the number of General Councils; and Bishop Hefele, their latest historian of councils, after stating the views of others, proceeds to give a corrected table of his own³. In such a case it is obvious that only those with regard to which there is, or shall come to be, an agreement, can claim to be regarded as real General Councils.

VIII.

And now it only remains, in conclusion, to point out certain positions which have

¹ Nicaea 325, Constantinople 381, Ephesus 431, Chalcedon 451, Constantinople 553, Constantinople 680. The English Council of Hatfield, in 680, accepted the "Five General Councils," and that of Lateran in the time of Pope Martin (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, vol. III, p. 141). And the Homily "Against Peril of Idolatry" speaks of the "six councils which were allowed and received of all men." For the witness of English writers, see Palmer, *Church of Christ*, part iv, chap. 9 (vol. II, p. 171 f.).

² Nicaea 787, and Constantinople 879.

³ See Hefele, *History of Councils*, vol. I, pp. 55 f. 63.

been taken up on the matter which are open to objection.

(1) In the first place, it has been claimed that a General Council is of itself infallible. Against this error enough has surely been said already: we can no more admit the infallibility of councils, than we can the infallibility of bishops or of popes. The mechanical theory of conciliar infallibility must surely stand self-condemned, to anyone who is cognisant of the facts.

(2) It has been claimed that the Pope of Rome is the proper summoner of General Councils; and the Roman controversialist Bellarmin has wasted a great deal of energy in trying to prove that all the early councils were so summoned excepting the seventh, to which he promptly refuses the title. But without going into details here, it must be enough to state that the first eight were undoubtedly summoned by the emperors. In the eighth, indeed, it was publicly stated by the priest Elias, the legate of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, that this was so¹. And it is acknow-

¹ "Scitote quia in praeteritis temporibus imperatores erant qui congregabant synodos ex toto terrarum orbe, &c." Quoted in Nicholas of Cusa, *De Concord. Cath.* iii. c. 13 (p. 793, ed. Basil. 1565). The passage does not appear to

ledged by Anastasius the Papal Librarian, by Nicholas of Cusa, by Ballerini, and even by Hefele, that some, at any rate, of these councils were summoned by the emperors, although later councils have indeed been summoned by popes.

(3) A word must be added with regard to the function of the emperors in this matter. They summoned the councils, because of the civil interests involved: they alone had the power. And it has been true ever since, that without the civil power no such assembly—not even the Vatican Council of twenty-five years ago, as Cardinal Manning himself acknowledges¹—could have met. The declaration of our Article, that “General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes²,” is simply the statement of a fact. “I cannot see in reason,” writes Bishop Beveridge, “how General Councils should be gathered together without the command of princes, seeing

be in the *Acts* in Mansi, vol. XVII, although there are other passages to much the same purpose (e.g. the speech of Photius in col. 504).

¹ Manning, *True Story of the Vatican Council* (Nineteenth Century, vol. I, p. 129).

² Art. xxi. “sine iussu et voluntate Principum congregari non possunt”—cannot be gathered together.

princes only have the command over those that are to be gathered together in these councils¹." But it has always been recognized, at least in theory,—by Constantine as by others—that the bishops are the judges. And if it was ever in danger of being forgotten, it was owing to the servility of the bishops.

(4) But at least, it is said, if the Pope does not summon it, a General Council cannot be held without his acquiescence. No doubt this is the modern Roman opinion; but if it means that the whole Church is powerless without him, it is easy to show *how* modern it is. The mediaeval theory of papal lordship, indeed, left little room for the activity of councils; and the councils of this period were mere papal receptions². But as soon as the ground had been cleared by Occam and Marsiglio, the older view re-asserted itself in all its strength³. Nicholas of Cusa, for instance, writing in the fifteenth century, of course does not suggest that the chief bishop of the West should be left out (nor do we)⁴;

¹ Beveridge, *On the Articles*, p. 391 (Oxford, 1846).

² See *The Pope and the Council*, Chap. iii. § 11.

³ See Appendix, p. 195.

⁴ There was indeed, according to Socrates (*H. E.* ii. 19), who is inexactly summarising the letter of Julius given

but he declares that if the pope will not come, the council can at once proceed without him¹. The witness of Cardinal Turrecremata is much the same. "If such a case should fall out," he says, "that all the fathers assembled in a General Council, with unanimous consent should make a decree concerning the faith, which the person of the pope alone should contradict², I would say according to my judgement that men were bound to stand to the judgement of the synod, and

in S. Ath. *Apol. c. Ar.*, an ancient custom to the effect that no canon was to be made for the whole Church without the Bishop of Rome. That this was claimed for him in the fifth century, then, we need not doubt. But it certainly was not held to mean that the Church was impotent in case of his failure; and any such idea would have been scouted in early days.

¹ *De Concord. Cath.* ii. 2.

² It is interesting to notice how Ballerini disposes of the possible case of a pope who falls into manifest heresy, in order to avoid ascribing superiority to a council. He is to be admonished once and again; and this may be by the cardinals, or the Roman clergy, or indeed anybody, since "*charitatis, non iurisdictionis, officium est.*" If he will not repent, he is *ipso facto* cut off, and "*nulla cuiusquam declaratio aut sententia necessaria est.*" And "*postea vero manifestato eius recessu ab ecclesia, si quae sententia a concilio in eundem ferretur, in eundem ferretur, qui pontifex amplius non esset, neque superior concilio*" (*De Potest. summorum Pontif. &c.* ix. § 2; Migne, *Cursus*, vol. III, col. 1374).

not to listen to the gainsaying of the person of the pope; for the judgement of so many and so great fathers in a General Council seemeth worthy to be preferred before the judgement of one man¹." The great Spanish theologian Tostatus of Avila, speaks to much the same effect: that "Jesus Christ has established a tribunal higher than the pope; and this tribunal, viz. a General Council, has power to judge the pope, not only in causes of the faith, but in many other causes²." It is well known that the great theologian afterwards known as Pope Adrian VI. held a like opinion. The Gallican writer Edmond Richer actually made the superiority of councils to the pope a matter of faith: and although Bossuet rejects this, he strongly affirms it himself as a fact³. And more than all, it is notorious that the great Council of Constance, part of which is recognized as ecumenical by most Roman authorities, declared that it derived its power direct from our Lord, and that, representing the Catholic Church militant, all persons within the Church,

¹ Quoted by Field, vol. IV, p. 34.

² Bossuet, *Gallia Orthodoxa*, xxiv. (The Dissertation prefixed to his *Def. Decl. Cler. Gallic.*).

³ *Ib.* xvii; cf. *Def. Decl. Cler. Gallic.* lib. vi, cap. 24 f.

even the pope, were subject to its authority¹.

With these matters I am not concerned in detail: it is enough for me to show how very slowly the most authoritative assembly of the whole Church came to be subjected to the growing power of the Bishop of Rome, until in our own day his infallibility has been made a matter of faith. I need hardly point out how such a claim stultifies all the earlier history of the Church, and reduces all the work of councils and synods, and all the careful study of earlier days, to mere nothingness: for what need of the study of "antiquity, universality, consensus," if there is an ever-present infallible authority which can produce cut-and-dried decrees in any emergency that may arise?

For our part, we have no desire to tempt others to set up an infallible bishop, by ourselves setting up an infallible council. We willingly remember that a council is not *necessarily* free from error: for we realize that the council is but a representation, so to speak, and a very imperfect one, of the whole Church. Once more, to quote

¹ Creighton, *History of the Papacy*, vol. I, p. 291 f: cf. p. 443 f.

Thomas Netter of Walden, we recognize "that only the consent of the fathers from the beginning . . . is to be listened and hearkened unto (as free from danger of erring, and next in degree of authority to Holy Scripture); and that no man should think it strange that the fathers in all ages successively should be accounted more certain and infallible judges of faith than a General Council of bishops meeting at one time and in one place, seeing that so many wise, just, and holy fathers can neither be contained within the straits of one place, nor are in the world at one time, but were given successively by Almighty God to give testimony unto the faith in their successive times, in a constant and a perpetual course: all which fathers we may gather together, and consult at once, so often as we desire to consult them, and to be resolved by them in matters of difficulty and doubt, though they could never be all assembled unto one place, or meet together, when they lived in the flesh ¹."

¹ *Doctrinale Fidei*, lib. II, art. ii, cap. 19 (quoted in Field, vol. IV, p. 53).

APPENDIX.

The Authority of Popes and General Councils (p. 190).

THE theory of the definite superiority of the pope to a General Council only grew very slowly. I am not aware of any instance of its being formally and authoritatively asserted before the year 1518, when Leo X, in his Bull *Pastor Aeternus*, declared that "the pope has full and unlimited authority over councils: he can at his good pleasure summon, remove, or dissolve them¹."

It would be impossible to trace the growth of the theory in detail here. But in addition to what has been said already, two points may be added:—

1. When Alexander III. summoned the Lateran Council of 1179, he did so expressly in order that, in accordance with old custom, that should be done by many which could not well be done by an individual².

¹ The Bull is quoted, e.g. in Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, p. 170.

² Letter of Alexander III. to the Bishops of Tuscany (Mansi, vol. XXII, col. 212): 'de diversis partibus personas

2. Melchior Canus, in discussing the nature of a council, strenuously upholds the right of the bishops to be true judges in it, and not merely assessors to the pope¹. And in this he fairly represents the opinion of his day. And, as is well known, this is more or less the position of the great Gallican writers².

ecclesiasticas decrevimus evocandas, quarum praesentia et consilio, quae fuerunt salubria statuuntur; et quod bonum, secundum consuetudinem antiquorum patrum, provideatur, et firmetur a multis. Quod si particulariter fieret, non facile posset plenum robur habere.'

¹ Melchior Canus, *de Locis Theologicis*, lib. v, cap. 5, no 2. This right is characteristically explained away by Ballerini, *De Potestate Summorum Pontificorum*, &c. ii. § 3.

² De Marca, *de Concord.* lib. v, capp. 8-12.

X.

II.

THE TEACHING POWER OF
THE CHURCH

E

No. X.

The Church Historical Society.

President:—THE RT. REVEREND M. CREIGHTON, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

The Teaching Power of the Church (II).

BY THE

REV. W. E. COLLINS, M.A.,

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY AT KING'S COLLEGE,
LONDON.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

LONDON:

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.; 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.

BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.

NEW YORK: E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.

1896.

SUMMARY.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY.—SCOPE OF THE LECTURE	53
I. THE CHURCH MUST ‘GUARD THE DEPOSIT’	55
(a) No introduction of foreign elements.	
(b) No further revelation.	
II. WITNESS THE PRIMARY FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH	59
Illustrated by the fact that	
(a) Innovators have tried to claim antiquity.	
(b) The greatest teachers lead us back to the Source.	
III. THE CHURCH THE JUDGE IN CONTROVERSIES OF FAITH	67
The true function of the Judge.	
IV. TWO PRACTICAL CONCLUSIONS	75
(1) Comparatively unimportant by whom the judgement is declared.	
(2) Wrong decisions may be given in matters of faith.	
V. THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH	79
Due to her Head, not to her members.	
To be found in the <i>whole</i> mind of the Church.	
True development.	
VI. THE ROMAN DOCTRINE OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND ITS CONSEQUENCES	86
(a) It gives a new meaning to the term Authority.	
(b) The Church regarded as a body containing certain authoritative agencies.	
(c) Promulgative authority takes the place of consentient witness.	
VII. THE AUTHORITY OF THE WHOLE CHURCH	89
(a) Is the authority recognized in early days.	
(b) Is eminently natural.	
(c) Commends itself to our experience.	

THE TEACHING POWER OF THE CHURCH.

‘Ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων.—S. Luke xxiv. 48.

WE have to-day to deal more particularly with the teaching power of the Church. It will be granted on all hands that it is the divinely appointed function of the Church to teach: but many questions still remain to be asked with regard to the nature of this *magisterium* or teaching power. What are its limitations? its safeguards? How can we be sure of its authenticity? Above all, how is it expressed? Now, some of these questions will be dealt with in the lectures which follow. To-morrow, for instance, the *magisterium* of the *Ecclesia diffusa* will be considered; and it will be shown that the episcopate throughout the world forms the normal organ of the Church's teaching power. The following lecture will deal with the authority of General Councils, i.e. the *magisterium* of the *Ecclesia congregata*; and the last will be concerned with the claims which have

been put forth on behalf of the Bishop of Rome (and exercised by him) to speak in the name of the whole Church—i.e. it will deal with the usurped *magisterium* of the Pope. It may be that this method of studying the subject will involve some slight amount of repetition; but this will be amply compensated for if the result be to place in clearer light the fundamental bearings of the whole question, by insisting and re-insisting upon them¹.

To-day, then, we are concerned more particularly with the nature of this teaching authority—this *magisterium*—in itself, apart from the particular manner in which it may happen to be expressed.

¹ "I have no doubt that both in these lectures and elsewhere many things will be found which have been already said both by myself and by other writers. Probably many things will be found which both myself and other writers may find occasion to say again, as often as it may be needful to put forth correct views of matters about which popular errors and confusions are afloat. There is a large class of persons who pay little heed to a thing which is said only once, but on whom, when it is said several times, and put in several shapes, it has at last an effect. I believe that this class is more numerous—its needs are certainly better worth attending to—than those fastidious persons who are disgusted if they are ever called upon to hear the same thing twice" (Freeman, *Comparative Politics*, page v).

I.

And first, if it be asked *what* it is that the Church is to teach, there can be no doubt as to the answer. She is to teach Christ—to bring men into contact with Christ, and to communicate to them the benefits of membership in Him. She represents Him to the world. He has ascended to the Father, yet in the Church He is still present. And the things which in the flesh “He began both to do and teach¹,” He is now bringing to their consummation in and through the Church. From this point of view, then, her function is clear: she is here in order that the verities of the faith should not be obscured in course of time, either by the suppression of some fundamental parts, or by the accretions of falsehood. She has to “guard the deposit².” This is obviously a very necessary function. For if we think of any historical religion, we shall see that it is liable to change—either by accretion or deterioration—in course of time. Unpalatable truths may be ignored or forgotten; effete ideas may be gradually discarded. Or on the other hand some new teacher may arise and modify the earlier

¹ Acts i. 1.² 1 Tim. vi. 20.

teaching; or new and foreign elements may be grafted upon the original stock, until its character is changed entirely.

Now with Christianity no such change is possible: it claims to be not only historical but absolute. *We* do not "look for another¹." Our faith is not a body of partial truths, suited to the present immature state of the human race. It is not merely a "tentative solution," a "fragmentary revelation," or a "revelation of the soul's wants," like the pre-Christian religions. Christianity claims to be the absolute religion. "It claims on the one side to be bound by no limits of place or time, or faculty or object, but to deal with the whole sum of being, and with the whole of each separate existence. It claims on the other side to give its revelation in facts which are an actual part of human experience²." And so it follows that no such alteration of the substance of the Christian faith is possible; and that in proportion as changes are introduced, the resulting product ceases to be Christianity. There is in our faith no element which can become effete and drop off; no element is lacking

¹ S. Matt. xi. 3.

² Westcott, *Gospel of Life*, p. 228.

which later ages can supply. The Christian Church must "guard the deposit." Other systems—the Buddhist religion, or the Wesleyan Society, or the Benedictine Order—are in no sense bound to adhere strictly to the teaching of their founders; for the founder is but the teacher of certain truths external to himself. And others may quite legitimately, and without disloyalty, supplement this teaching out of any fuller knowledge which they may possess; indeed, in proportion as they do so they will be loyal to his spirit. But not so with the Church. Her Founder is Himself the Way in which she is to walk: He is Himself the Truth which she exists to teach; He is Himself the Life by which she lives¹. To add to or subtract from His teaching would be treason: it would be the destruction of her very existence as the Church of Christ.

Every churchman is aware that this is the teaching of Holy Scripture upon the subject. (a) There can be no introduction of foreign elements. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ²," says S. Paul to the Corinthians. He writes

¹ S. John xiv. 6.

² 1 Cor. iii. 11.

to them again, fearing that they may be "corrupted from the simplicity and purity which is towards Jesus," if any coming to them should "preach another Jesus," or if they should receive "a different spirit," or "a different gospel¹." To the Galatians he writes, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema²." (b) Nor can there be any further revelation: there is nothing analagous to the progressive covenant-revelations to the Hebrews. S. Timothy is to "keep the deposit which is committed to him³;" and the Christian people are exhorted to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints⁴." In short, "it is of the very essence of the Christian revelation that as originally given it is final⁵." The office of the Church, from this point of view, is to dissipate the obstacles of time and space and circumstance which separate us from our Lord's own teaching, to keep us face to face with the facts as

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 3, 4, R.V.

² Gal. i. 8.

³ 1 Tim. vi. 20.

⁴ Jude 3. Cf. 2 John 2.

⁵ Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 38.

facts, and enable us more and more to realize their significance. The divinely appointed teacher can only teach that faith which she taught from the beginning. She cannot modify that which she teaches, for from the beginning that which was committed to her was the whole truth. And she is bound to carry it on from age to age, without accretion, without loss.

II.

In other words, the teaching office of the Church is primarily that of *witness*. It is not her function to *reveal* truth; but her very existence is bound up with the fact that she is, like her Lord¹, a faithful Witness. Witness to the faith once delivered is not only her positive duty but the very condition of her being. It is by this constant witness by means of Creeds and Liturgies, of the Christian Ministry, of parents and teachers, that the young are built up in the faith, and the life of the Church carried on from age to age. "The Church," says an English writer, "is a society in which, by the divine institution,

¹ Rev. i. 5.

a great and complicated system of instruction is always to continue¹." And this continuity of teaching is of no less moment than continuity of organization. "The apostles' doctrine" goes hand in hand with "the apostles' fellowship²." There is an apostolical succession of doctrine as well as of ministry. So when Tertullian is dealing with the heretics of his day, he demands that they shall unfold the roll of their bishops, "whom, as having been appointed to their episcopate by the apostles, they regard as transmitters of the apostolic seed³." But, he continues, even this by itself is not enough. "For their very doctrine, being compared with that of the apostles, will declare by its own diversity and contrariety that it had for its author neither an apostle nor an apostolic man," since apostolical Churches, whatever the date of their foundation, are known by "kinship of doctrine⁴."

The Church, then, cannot reveal new truth; and, on the other hand, she has an unfailing

¹ Palmer, *Church of Christ*, vol. II, p. 77.

² Acts ii. 42.

³ Tert. *De Præscr.* 32: "quos ab apostolis in episcopatum constitutos apostolici seminis traduces habeant."

⁴ "Pro consanguinitate doctrinae."

touchstone by which to test the truth of any doctrine which may become current. That which is novel, or local, or partial, cannot be true. Her writers are never tired of declaring the fact. The early manual known as the *Teaching of the Apostles* reveals to us a very immature phase of Christian life, but declares clearly enough that a prophet who brings new doctrine is not to be received¹. "Therefore it is necessary," says S. Irenaeus, "that we who are in the Church should listen to the elders of the Church, those who, as we have shown, have the succession from the apostles; who together with the succession of the episcopate have received the sure gift of the truth according to the Father's will²." S. Athanasius is never tired of pointing out that the Arian heresy is a novelty of his own day, and taunts its followers with dating their brand-new creeds, in order to mark when it was that they believed so-and-so. And he con-

¹ c. II: ἐὰν δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ διδάσκων στραφεῖς διδάσκη ἄλλην διδαχὴν εἰς τὸ καταλύσαι, μὴ αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε.

² St. Iren. *Adv. Haer.* iv. 26: Quapropter eis qui in Ecclesia sunt, presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab apostolis, sicut ostendimus; qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum, secundum placitum Patris acceperunt.

trasts with their conduct that of the Council of Nicaea, which legislated concerning discipline, but simply declared the faith: "without prefixing consulate, month, and day, they wrote concerning Easter, 'It seemed good as follows;' for it did then seem good that there should be a general compliance in this matter. But concerning the faith they wrote not 'It seemed good,' but 'Thus believes the Catholic Church;' and thereupon they confessed how they believed, in order to show that their own sentiments were not novel but apostolical; and what they wrote down was no discovery of theirs, but is the same as was taught by the apostles¹." The famous *Commonitorium* of S. Vincent of Lerins is to the same effect: "We within the Catholic Church are to take great care, that we hold that which hath been believed, everywhere, always, and by all men. . . . And that we shall do if we follow Universality, Antiquity, and Consensus. Universality we shall follow if we confess that one faith to be true which the whole Church throughout the world confesses; Antiquity, if we depart in no wise from those truths which it is plain that our holy forefathers held; and Consensus, if in this antiquity it-

¹ S. Ath. *de Synodis*, § 5.

self we follow the definitions and sentences of all, or practically all, the priests and doctors together¹." And so, if some new infection of heresy shall threaten to defile even the whole Church, then a Catholic Christian must "take care that he adheres to antiquity, which cannot possibly now be seduced by any deception of novelty²." But it is needless to multiply illustrations of a principle which has been at all times accepted—a principle which was set before themselves by the reformers of the sixteenth century, by Luther and Cranmer and Jewel, however deplorably they may have failed in their application of it in particular cases; a principle which is held and recognized, in theory if not in fact, throughout the whole Catholic Church.

Two kinds of indirect testimony are, however, worth noticing:

(1) Innovators upon the faith have generally tried to bolster up their novelties by making for them a fictitious claim to antiquity. Thus the Gnostics, and others who improved upon the Christian revelation, often claimed³ that their peculiar tenets were a "hidden wisdom" which

¹ S. Vincent. *Commonitorium*, c. 2.

² Ibid. c. 3.

³ e.g. S. Irenæus *adv. Haer.* iii. 2.

had always been held amongst "them that were perfect." Thus, when Popes first presumed to speak in the name of the whole Church on doubtful points, they at least claimed that these oracular utterances were based upon secret stores of divine truth which had been handed down¹. And the doctrinal accretions of the middle ages were commonly believed to be based upon secret primitive tradition; which tradition in turn was looked upon, not as a concurrent but an independent witness to the truth. Of course, if they had but known it, any such claim had been refuted in advance by Tertullian, who maintained against the heretics of his day, with convincing force, that there was and could be no such secret element in the Christian Gospel². He points out that S. Timothy is to teach the things which he heard, not secretly, but "in the presence of many witnesses"³; that the Lord's

¹ See, e.g. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, vol. I, pp. 737-8; Gieseler, *Church History*, vol. I, pp. 435, 451; Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, pp. 41-2.

² Tert. *De Præscr.* xxv-xxvii. Cf. S. Iren. *ut supr.*; and the other writers quoted, e.g. in Jeremy Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, Part I, Book I, Sections 2, 3; and Browne, *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, Art. vi, § 1.

³ "Coram multis testibus," ■ Tim. ii. 2 (διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων).

own teaching was open, "without a sign of any hidden mystery"¹; and that time after time He had commanded them to publish what they heard. He used to tell them that a candle is not pushed away under a bushel, but placed on a candlestick, so as to give light to all that are in the house. And these things, Tertullian concludes, the apostles either neglected or failed to understand if they disobeyed them by concealing any portion of the light.

(2) The second indirect testimony to our principle is this: If we think of the Church's greatest teachers of later days, we shall invariably find that they are those who lead us back to the well of primitive truth. It has been well said that real progress in natural science means a fuller realization of Newton's great principles; that progress in philosophy means "Back to Kant," and in politics "Back to Aristotle"². It is true in a far deeper sense of theology that all progress is a return to the first principles and a deeper realization of them³. And every great teacher,

¹ "Sine ulla significatione alicuius taciti sacramenti."

² Pollock, *History of the Science of Politics*, p. 19.

³ Cf. Herder's teaching: "Study the sources; back to the original documents." (Quoted by Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 200.)

however original he may seem, realizes this clearly. "I have affirmed continually," wrote Frederick Denison Maurice, "that I have discovered nothing; that what I am saying is to be found in every creed of the Christian Church¹"; and he was right.

I have already said, and the fact must never be forgotten, that the Roman Church is quite definitely committed to the same principle—that the Church cannot reveal new articles of faith. Thus Cardinal Newman wrote, "Every Catholic holds that the Christian dogmas were in the Church from the time of the Apostles²." Thus Father Clarke says that the Church "cannot change one iota of the faith once delivered to the saints³." And, indeed, it is stated in the very constitution *Pastor Aeternus*, by which the Infallibility was promulgated: "For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter in order that, by His revelation, they might publish any new doctrine, but that, He helping them, they might sacredly guard and faithfully expound the deposit of

¹ Maurice, *Doctrine of Sacrifice*, p. x.

² Quoted in Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 37. Compare the quotation from Keenan's *Catechism* on p. 38.

³ R. F. Clarke, *The Church and the Bible*, p. 59.

faith¹." Whether or not this is the view held by most uneducated Roman Catholics may well be doubted by anybody who is acquainted with them even in England; and it is hardly to be wondered at. However, to this principle the Roman Church is committed; here at least we stand upon common ground. And for this very reason it is that our position is one of constant protest against a body of doctrines which we believe to be alien to the original faith, and of constant appeal to history, which alone can prove the fact.

III.

If it had always been possible to deal with strange opinions at the very time when they first arose, and if men were always willing to submit their speculations to the authority of the Church—"if they would run to prophets, or apostles, or evangelists, instead of to themselves," as Pope Leo the Great says²—the Church would have no need to exercise any other function with regard to the faith than that of witness. But unfortunately it

¹ *Pastor Aeternus*, cap. iv. (*Décrets et Canons du Concile Œcuménique*, p. 154, ed. Paris, 1874).

² S. Leo. *Ep.* xxviii. 1.

is otherwise. Heresies do not generally arise all of a sudden. As a rule they spring from laying undue emphasis upon some special side of the truth (which haply was somewhat overlooked just before), and pressing it to the neglect of all the rest, and exaggerating it and distorting it until the partial truth becomes total error. By the light of later events it is easy to trace the origins of Arianism earlier than Arius, and of Transubstantiation earlier than Paschasius and his fellows; and other heresies and untenable views in like manner, sometimes to a learned school, sometimes to an unlearned popular opinion. And again, when the heresy does become notorious, its teachers are generally so honestly anxious on behalf of their element of truth, and so desperately in love with the work of their own minds, that they are little ready to submit it to the true touchstone. Consequently, the heresy grows and spreads, and the Church has a further function to perform—that of a judge. In the words of our Article of Religion, “The Church . . . hath authority in controversies of faith¹.”

In case heresy should arise then, or in case new circumstances should necessitate a decision

¹ Art. xx.

on the part of the Church upon some point touching the faith which has not previously been declared explicitly, it is the function of the Church to judge, not of the individual. We are not concerned at present with the method of this judgement, or its ministers, but with the fact.

So it was in the first days, and so it has been ever since. We read in the Acts of the Apostles that news reached "the apostles and brethren in Judaea" to the effect that "the Gentiles also had received the word of God" (in the person of Cornelius and his household, just baptized by S. Peter). The apostle was called upon by "them of the circumcision" to explain his action; and he did so by showing that it was due to the direct guidance of God. Thereupon (not before, be it observed) the Church ratified the matter with her approval: "When they heard these things, they held their peace and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life¹."

¹ Acts xi. 1-18. It will be remembered that subsequently the relation of the Gentile converts to the Jewish law was considered and legislated upon by the assembled Church (Acts xv. 1-29). As this was a matter of discipline rather than of faith, it was decided by the

And what was done on this occasion has been done ever since: one question of doctrine after another has arisen and been discussed, and pondered over or wrangled over, until at length, on the basis of already-existing revelation, the Church has spoken—by a council, or by the consent of great doctors, or by the gradual rejection of the false opinion by the general consciousness of the Church. And thereupon her faithful children obey her voice¹. Thus, in one or other of these ways, the chiliasm of much early teaching died out, and the question of the validity of heretical baptism was settled, and the great heresies were one by one defeated. But it would be useless to multiply instances; for it must be evident to anybody who considers the question that the Church of the living God is the judge in controversies of faith: that she who is the pillar and ground of the truth² must be authorized to judge what the truth is, and to separate herself from false teachers.

Church of her own power, on the basis of the previous revelation, and the Prophets. (See verses 7-9, 14-18.)

¹ I am here much indebted to a sermon by the Rev. A. W. Robinson, Warden of All Hallows, Barking.

² 1 Tim. iii. 15. See Palmer, *Church of Christ*, vol. II, pp. 96-102.

But having said this much, we must at once proceed to guard ourselves by explaining what judgement means. It has been pointed out by an English theologian of the seventeenth century that "judgement is of two sorts: the first, of definitive and authentic power; the second, of recognition. The judgement of authentic power, defining what is to be thought of each thing, and prescribing to men's consciences so to think, is proper to God, ... Who ... maketh known unto men what they must think, and persuadeth them what to think¹." In other words, it is God Who alone is the *source* of right, which exists of Him and because of Him; so that what He judges right is right *ipso facto*, and what He judges wrong is wrong *ipso facto*. Dean Field goes on to say that the judgement of the Church is of necessity of the other kind, of recognition: i.e. the Church judges a doctrine to be true or false because it agrees with or differs from a pre-existing standard of truth—viz. the faith which was in the Church from the beginning.

A little thought will show that this must be so, especially if we consider the function

¹ Field, *Of the Church*, vol. II, pp. 438-9.

of the judge in civil matters. His proper work is not to *make* a thing right or wrong, but simply to *declare* whether it is right or wrong, from his knowledge of the facts, and of the principles which apply in such a case. The matter is unfortunately complicated for us by the fact that the judge is frequently able to do things which are not purely judicial. It has generally been recognized, for example, that no system of human law is perfect; and accordingly the judge often has a certain power of expanding or modifying the law—through such things as the “residual justice” supposed to reside in a king¹, or the Praetor’s Edict in Rome, or “case-made” law in England², or the arbitrary decisions of a Kadi in the East. But such things, it is plain, are not strictly part of his function, and are only possible because the law which he exists to administer is such an imperfect one. The true human court, we must bear in mind, is a court of record. We can see it best, in its essential features, in the popular court of very early days; there was no written

¹ For further details see Maine, *Early Law and Custom*, chap. vi.

² Maine, *Ancient Law*, chaps. ii. and iii.

law, and the idea that law could be created by the fiat of an individual would have been absolutely inconceivable. The place of written law, however, was taken by *custom*, very carefully observed and preserved. When a difficulty arose which needed a judicial decision, the one question to be asked was, How did our fathers act? What is the custom (or law—they were one and the same thing) regulating this matter? The elder and wiser men gave their evidence, the principles were clearly seen and explained, and a consensus of voices pronounced a decision which was not their own—not in any sense representing their own personal views—but representing (in theory at least) what had been the custom always, throughout the tribe, and held by the whole tribe¹.

Now the analogy between the judgement of a customary court in early days, and that of the Catholic Church in matters of faith, is a very close one. The Catholic Church has, not only in theory, however, but in fact, no power to judge as the temper of the

¹ See for example, Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité Antique*, Book iii, chap. 11; Maine, *Village Communities*, Lects. ii, iii; Hearn, *The Aryan Household*, chap. xvii; and Holland, *Jurisprudence*, chap. v. 1.

moment wills, but must judge in accordance with what has been held "*ubique, semper, ab omnibus*." She is a court of record: to settle a difficult question with regard to the faith she must have resort to her Scriptures, her councils, her doctors, her wise men of old days; and contrary to them, without or outside their witness, she can decide nothing. Where the Church and the ancient civil court differ, the Church is the more conservative. For in an ancient society, where antiquity gave no guidance, there was always room for some augury, some "theme" or "diké" which should supply guidance¹, and this in time became part of the customary law; or new customs might grow up insensibly. But we have already seen that there is no possibility of new revelations of this kind in the Church. She can only judge by the standard of old days. In fact—and this is all-important—we are brought round to the same position as before; viz. that the teaching power of the Church lies in her witness to the truth. Her word of condemnation is, "We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God²."

¹ Maine, *Ancient Law*, chap. i.

² 1 Cor. xi. 16.

IV.

Two conclusions would seem to follow from what has been said with regard to the function of the Church as a judge in controversies. (1) Seeing that the Church does not *make* articles of faith, but witnesses to their being so, it is by comparison a matter of lesser moment by whom the judgement is actually delivered—whether by an individual bishop, or a local synod of bishops, or a general synod. For in any case the person or persons who happen to be the mouthpiece declare what they believe to be the witness, the judgement, of the whole Church; and the final ratification of every such judgement is the same, namely, the consensus of the Universal Church. And just as the force and bearing of any of the laws of England may be declared by a metropolitan magistrate or a local justice of the peace, so may the mind of the Church be spoken (as it often has been) by a single bishop. Of course, there may be an appeal against the magistrate's decision to the Divisional Court (or however it may be), and it may be reversed, and so may the single bishop's or the synod's; but if so, it is simply on the ground that it does

not represent the law of the land in the one case, nor the faith of the Church in the other. But the resemblance is obvious: the magistrate's decision becomes a "leading case" because it accurately and incontrovertibly represents the meaning of the English law¹; and the judgement as to the faith is accepted universally for the same reason,—because it accurately and incontrovertibly represents the mind of the Church. That is to say, it is merely the putting into words of what was always part of the faith².

(2) To pass on to the second consequence. Since, as we have seen, every judgement as to the Faith is made in the name of the Church (just as every civil judgement is made in the name of the Law), it follows that decisions of faith in the name of the whole Church may be wrongly made. It is indeed a matter of notorious fact that they have been so made time after time. Nay more,

¹ Or at least, what people are content to accept for the time being as the meaning of the law. It is the virtue of the law that it grows and becomes modified in course of time; but on the other hand, the virtue of the Faith is that it is unchangeable. So that here the resemblance ends.

² "Non introducit jus novum, sed ipsum declarat" (Durand de Maillane, *Dict. du Droit Canon*, s.v. Publicatio).

wrong decisions of faith may be so made, as our Twenty-first Article of Religion says, and sometimes have been made, by (would-be) General Councils, "forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God." It is even conceivable that the whole Church at any particular time should *seem* to concur in a false decision as to the faith. For we must remember that the power of speaking authoritatively in the name of the whole Church—the "judgement of jurisdiction"—belongs only to some of its members: and it is possible that all of these, at some particular time, should be upholders of heresy, or at least not capable of refuting it when it was taught¹. "There come times," says a modern theologian, "when the spirit of

¹ "Touching the judgement of recognition, we acknowledge the judgement of the Universal Church, comprehending the faithful that are and have been, to be infallible. In the Church that comprehendeth only the believers that live at one time in the world, there is always found a right judgement of discretion, and a right pronouncing of each thing necessary, all never falling into damnable error, nor into any error pertinaciously; but a right judgement of men, by their power of jurisdiction maintaining the truth and suppressing error, is not always found" (Field, *Of the Church*, vol. II, p. 440).

error . . . spreads abroad in the Church, and it becomes the duty of the faithful few, or the faithful one, to withstand the prevalent false doctrine of the day¹." "It is possible," writes the great canonist of the fifteenth century, Cardinal Panormitan (Nicolaus de Tudeschis), "It is possible that the true faith of Christ might remain in a single person; so that it would still be true to say that the Faith would not have failed in the Church, seeing that the rights of the Church might reside in a single person whilst others sinned²". But to leave hypothetical cases: Our Lord intimated plainly that this might actually happen. "Except those days should be shortened," He said, "there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets . . . insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect³." And again, "Many

¹ Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, chap. viii. § 7. William of Occam says, as most mediaeval writers would say, that under such circumstances men have nothing left unto them, but with sorrowful hearts to refer all to God (*Dial. Lib. V, Par. i, cap. 28*). I owe the reference to Dr. Field's work.

² Panormitan. super Decret. I. 1, *De Electione*. Quoted in Owen, *Dogmatic Theology*, p. 58. The whole passage is very interesting.

³ S. Matt. xxiv. 22, 24.

false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many¹." And S. Paul writes to the Thessalonians, "That day shall not come, except there come a falling away first²." And many parts of the Revelation of S. John the Divine would seem to point to the same thing³. And we know that it has happened so. The Councils of Seleucia and Ariminum practically betrayed the Church into an Arian profession: yet the faith was not thereby lost. When Liberius the Roman bishop was brought before the Arian Emperor Constantius, and taunted with the fact that he was the sole western champion of the Catholic faith, "The cause of the faith," he exclaimed, "is none the worse because I happen to be left alone⁴." And when at length, worn out by torture and insults, Liberius signed a heretical creed, S. Athanasius stood alone against the world. And yet the cause of the Faith was "none the worse," nor can be.

V.

It might seem as if all this militates against the infallibility of the Church. I answer that

¹ S. Matt. xxiv. 11.

² 2 Thess. ii. 3. Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 1. ³ e.g. Rev. xiii.

⁴ Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 16: Οὐ, διὰ τὸ εἶναι με μόνον, ὁ τῆς πιστέως ἐλαττοῦται λόγος.

it rather proves it. And this is our next point. That the Church is infallible is part of our faith; for it is part of the original deposit. "On this Rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it¹." "I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world²."

But these sayings of our Lord at once point us to the true nature of her infallibility. The Church is infallible, not because of her doctors and teachers, her councils and her bishops, but because of her Lord. It is not that her members, or any of them, are infallible,—not that they are "verbally inspired," so to speak, in such a way that what they do is not their own act, but merely done through them as a medium. The Church has this treasure in earthen vessels. She is infallible because her Lord will not suffer her to fail. She is infallible in spite of her members, just as she is *One* in spite of all our disunions, and *Holy* in spite of all our sins; *Catholic* in spite of all our narrowness and sectarianism, and *Apostolic* in spite of all our unapostolic spirit. If the greater number of her members on earth at any moment fall away into heresy, she remains infallible still. For we must

¹ S. Matt. xvi. 18.

² S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

never forget that it is the whole Church, the whole building of Christ, which is infallible: the whole Church in her length as well as her breadth, not only from one side of the globe to the other, but from the Day of Pentecost to our own day, and on to the Day of Judgement; nay more, in her depth and height, here on earth and at rest beyond the grave, and in heaven itself, where her Head now is. It is the whole Church which is infallible—infallible because He will not suffer her to fall. In heaven she cannot fail. And so we are certain—does not the teaching of history as well as the words of our Lord justify us?—we are certain that here on earth, as His witness in the world, the Church of God will never fall. Those who speak in her name may fail. The *Zeitgeist*, the spirit of the age, may cause us to appreciate certain aspects of the truth only, to the neglect, it may be, of others no less precious¹. But the great stream of God's truth does not and cannot fail. There will always be a remnant to carry on the faith to more faithful days; God will always have

¹ "Neither is a consensus of the entire Church of to-day sufficient, unless it be in harmony with the teaching of other ages also" (Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, chap. viii. § 7).

saints who, filled not with the spirit of the age but the Spirit of Truth, will realize, each in his degree, the whole proportion of the faith.

It is then this whole mind of the Church to which we are to look for God's guidance, as expressed in the Creeds and the Fathers, and proved by the Scriptures. Such was the statement of S. Vincent: we are to follow "those who living at different times and places, continued yet in the communion and faith of one Catholic Church¹." Such is the testimony of a great English theologian of the middle ages, Thomas Netter of Walden, who writes: "It is not therefore any special Church—neither the African which Donatus so much admired, nor the particular Roman Church—which holds the faith which cannot be removed, but the universal Church: and this not as gathered together in general councils (since we have found these to have erred sometimes), but that Catholic Church of Christ which hath been dispersed throughout the whole world, ever since the baptism of Christ, through the apostles and their successors, and continued down to our own day; which undoubtedly keepeth the true faith and

¹ *Commonitorium*, c. iii.

the faithful witness of Christ, teaching wisdom unto babes, and holding fast to the truth amidst the worst errors¹." Noble words these, as are all which Waldensis has to say upon the subject.

The *whole* mind of the Church: we cannot be content with anything less. The words which I have just read ought to convince us that we cannot ignore the later mind of the Church. We could not, if we would, cut ourselves off from eighteen centuries of human thought, from the Holy Spirit's work in His Church from the beginning till now. The Christian faith indeed does not grow, but we grow into it². There is a very false sense in which we may think of development of doctrine, but our very dread of the term has perhaps kept us from realizing adequately the truth which it was meant to express. We cannot ignore the ripening of the Church's

¹ *Doctrinale Fidei*, lib. ii, art. ii, cap. 19 (quoted in Field, *Of the Church*, vol. IV, p. 52).

² Cf. Fairbairn, *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 41 f.: "Supremacy and permanence belong to Him alone . . . the growth into His spirit has been a matter of centuries, and proceeds but slowly even yet. The literature of to-day is worthier of Him than the literature of the second or third century; the religious consciousness has fewer pagan and more Christian elements now than it had then." I purposely omit the words that follow.

mind and judgement in later days. God has been leading His Church on by a path of unconscious but never-ceasing progress. Two ways in particular may be noticed in which the Church of later days has grown in her realization of the faith. (1) When the Church is brought face to face with some heresy, it is often necessary to safeguard the faith by some formal statement of a truth which had hitherto not been expressed by a formula. Thus, for example, the Nicene Creed was formulated as a safeguard against the new Arian heresy. In such a case, in the words of S. Vincent, the Church "consigns to posterity in the security of a formal document, what she had received from her ancestors by mere tradition," and "stamps with the speciality of a new term an article of the faith which is not new¹." (2) But there is a somewhat different growth which we are perhaps more in danger of forgetting. The only way of entering upon the riches of faith is by believing; and by believing the Church

¹ S. Vinc. *Commonitorium*, c. xxiii: "Quod prius a majoribus sola traditione susceperat, hoc deinde posteris etiam per scripturae chirographum consignet . . . non novum fidei sensum, novae appellationis proprietate signando." See Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, pp. 53, 54.

is constantly growing into an ever fuller knowledge and realization of the Truth. And here again S. Vincent is a wise guide. "Fitting it is," writes he, "that the understanding, knowledge, and wisdom, as of one man, so also of the Church, should increase and abundantly go forward in the course of the centuries; but yet, after its own order; that is, in the same doctrine, the same sense, the same judgement." "The religion of our souls," he goes on, "should imitate the nature of our bodies, which develop and unfold their proportions, yet remain the same as they were. So also the doctrine of the Christian religion should follow the laws of growth; that is to say, in years it should wax sounder, in time it should become ampler, with continuance it should become more exalted, and yet remain uncorrupt and entire, full and perfect in the proportions of each one of its parts, and, so to speak, with the whole list of its members and its senses complete: and that beyond this it admit no further change, no loss of what is proper to it, no variety in definition¹." In a word, of the seed of wheaten teaching we should reap the fruit of wheaten doctrine.

¹ St. Vinc. *Commonitorium*, c. xxiii.

Nothing could be more beautiful or more true. It is the very teaching which has been given us in this age by the Bishop of Durham. "As the circumstances of men and nations change, materially, intellectually, morally, the life will find a fresh and corresponding expression. We cannot believe what was believed in another age by repeating the formulas which were then current. The greatest words change in meaning. The formulas remain to us a precious heritage, but they require to be interpreted. Each age has to apprehend vitally the Incarnation and the Ascension of Christ¹."

VI.

There is then such a thing as a Christian sense—the mind of the whole Church²; and it is this which is our guide, and the real authority behind every definition of faith. But it may be that this is a kind of authority "less simple than human impatience could wish³." So it has proved; and the

¹ Westcott, *Gospel of Life*, p. 281. The whole chapter should be read. Cf. Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, No. iv, and Salmon, *Infallibility*, pp. 276-7.

² "Ecclesiastica intelligentia" (S. Vinc. *Commonit.* ii.); ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φρόνημα (Eus. *H. E.* v. 27).

³ Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, chap. viii. § 7.

consequence is that men have accepted the idea of an infallible oracle embodied in the person of the Pope of Rome. With the steps by which this unheard-of novelty was gradually built up we are not now concerned ; but it will be well to point out certain consequences which inevitably follow from the dogma of Papal Infallibility, which is its culminating point.

(a) It gives an entirely new meaning to the term authority. In Thorndike's words, it is no longer "that which consisteth in testifying the faith once delivered, but in creating that which never was of force until the exercise of it ¹." For although it is true that this "authority" only professes to "guard and expound the deposit of faith," it is at least unquestionable that it claims to declare things to be *de fide* which previously were not so.

(b) No doubt Roman writers still continue to speak of the "authority of the Church ;" but it is the inevitable result of their position that they tend to make the Church not an authoritative body, but a body within which there are certain authoritative agencies ². The

¹ Thorndike, *On the Principles of Christian Truth* (Works, vol. II, p. 562).

² This is explicitly stated, indeed, in the Constitution *Pastor Aeternus* : "ideoque ejusmodi Romani Pontificis

attentive reading, for example, of what is said in nearly any Roman treatise upon the infallibility of the Church will make this clear¹. Indeed, it is not easy to see how it could be otherwise when authority is thought of as bound up in and springing from a single individual. I remember on one occasion a pupil of mine asked me whether an "Ultramontanist" was the same thing as a Montanist, only more so. There is more in the question than might at first appear: for however they may differ in other ways, they agree in setting up an infallible authority other than that of the Church Catholic.

(c) Although, as has been said, the Roman Church is definitely committed to the position that the Church cannot reveal truth, yet the contrary doctrine is surely an inevitable result of their teaching as to the Pope's authority. For "no one, I imagine," writes Dr. Westcott, "would seriously hold that the doctrines of contemporary Romanism have been secretly taught from the days of the apostles in an unbroken succession²." And as it has been pointed

definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse" (*Décrets et Canones*, p. 156).

¹ e.g. Regnier, *De Ecclesia Christi*, Part I, § 3.

² *Gospel of Life*, p. 280.

out¹, the papal idea is the natural expression of promulgative authority, but not at all of consentient witness, which is the true function of the Church with regard to doctrine². It would be a strange procedure to substitute one person for the myriad voices of Christendom, that out of the mouth of *one* witness every word should be established. But if there is to be substituted for the cumulative evidence of testimony the single voice of a promulgative authority, all is explained. Only, the faith once for all delivered is thereby betrayed. And it may be doubted whether, on the darkest night, the glimmer of an *ignis fatuus* can be of much assistance.

VII.

(a) For at least it is beyond dispute that the authority of the Church as a whole is the authority which Christians of the early Church knew, and to which they commended themselves. S. Vincent, for instance, was writing for

¹ Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 42.

² To which, be it observed, this lecture refers throughout. It is agreed on all hands that, in the words of our Twentieth Article of Religion, "The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies"; and the relation of any special part of the Church to the canons made in former days is not now in question.

the ordinary Christian, "with the fidelity of a reporter," as he says, "rather than the presumption of an author¹"; his purpose is "not to say all that might be said, but just to touch upon such things as are necessary²," and that "in easy and common speech³." And according to him the Catholic Christian is to consult the Scriptures for himself, and in interpretation of them to prefer antiquity to novelty, and the decrees of a general council before the temerity and folly of a few. And if there be none, he is to consult the ancient Fathers' opinions, "who, living at divers times and places, continued yet in the communion and faith of one Catholic Church." S. Chrysostom gives very similar guidance to an inquirer who came to him⁴; and the Fathers never dreamt of any other way. Even the great French bishop Bossuet speaks to much the same effect. In case of false definitions of faith, he says, there will be no danger of schism, "for the learned will be held by tradition, and the unlearned, if they are true sons

¹ "Relatoris fide potius quam auctoris praesumptione."
—S. Vinc. *Commonit.* i.

■ "Ut nequaquam omnia, sed tantum necessaria quaeque perstringam."

³ "Facile, communique sermone."

⁴ See Gore, *op. cit.*, p. 47, and note.

of the Church, will wait most obediently for the judgement of their pious mother¹."

(b) And this authority commends itself to us by its naturalness. God usually guides us and speaks to us from within, and teaches us by all sorts of unseen ways—ways which exercise and call forth all our capacities. Such a guidance is that of the Church's authority. In a world where we know in part, are we naturally led to expect an external guide, of such a kind as to save us all trouble and exertion? Rather, as one has said, "God has taken a way of speaking through His Church which is more like His usual methods, more vital and less mechanical than that;—a way which involves more discipline to faith, as well as to intelligence, than the consulting of an external oracle and the submission to ready-made decrees²."

(c) And lastly, this authority commends itself to our consciences and our hearts, and calls forth our most abundant thankfulness. No doubt it is easier to have an authority which can be consulted at a moment's notice, and which can utter oracular responses to order; but we have yet to learn that what

¹ Bossuet, *Defen. Decl. Cleri Gallicani*, x. 36.

² Mason, *op. cit.*

is easier is therefore better. No doubt the life of the Church as we know it is not free from difficulties: so it must be, or "what's a heaven for?" But we thankfully realize that we have the authority which God gave, and it suffices us. We have found by experience, that conforming our minds to the mind of the Church is at once a sure joy in the Communion of Saints, and a safe guide in the Catholic faith. And therefore we thank and praise Almighty God for His most excellent gift.

The Church Historical Society.

President :—THE RIGHT REVEREND J. WORDSWORTH, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Chairman :—THE RIGHT REVEREND W. E. COLLINS, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR.

LXXXII.

The Rights of a Particular Church in Matters of Practice.

BY

WILLIAM EDWARD COLLINS, D.D.,

BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR; FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL
HISTORY AT KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

LONDON:

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.; 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.
BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.
NEW YORK: E. S. GORHAM.

1904.

NOTE.

THE following paper was read at the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Church Historical Society, held at Sion College on Wednesday, December 9, 1903. Notes have been added, and a few additions and corrections have been made; otherwise it is printed as it was read.

W. E. C.

THE RIGHTS OF A PARTICULAR CHURCH IN MATTERS OF PRACTICE.

THE object which I have set myself in this paper is a very simple one. It is, in a word, to inquire into the powers of a local, particular, or national church in the matter of ordaining or otherwise forming for itself new customs or rites, and abolishing those which have previously existed. It is of course acknowledged on all hands that such a particular or national church has certain rights in such matters. Customs good or bad are being formed or modified day by day by a kind of unconscious growth or decline; and again, from time to time such customs or practices are inaugurated by an express legislative act of the body; and nobody would say that either of these is in itself *ultra vires*. But there are a great many persons who hold that modifications of this kind can only take place within very narrow limits: that the possibilities of the future are very closely

restricted by the history of the past, and that the liberty of the single church only extends within a certain area prescribed by the practice of the bodies which, together with it, make up the unity of the Church Catholic. It is this question which I propose to discuss.

To begin with, it will be well to clear the ground by saying something in the way of definition.

I. First, I am here concerned not with formularies of faith, still less with the faith itself, but with practice. It is no doubt true that practices have their importance, in the minds of those who hold them important, as expressions of doctrine, but that is not the point. In itself, the existence of a particular practice does not necessarily imply the holding of a particular doctrine; and most certainly the cessation of such a practice does not necessarily imply the giving up of any such doctrine. The two things can be kept quite distinct: for our purpose they must be. The old lady who said with regard to her new parish priest "He wears something at the back of his neck that looks like a shirt button, but they tell me that it's really the thin end of the wedge," was guilty of a confusion of

thought. In her case it was natural enough ; but it is not creditable in us if we cannot discuss questions of practice without falling into the same confusion.

2. Secondly, Let me add a word of definition with regard to what I have spoken of as a local, particular, or national church. What do we mean by this? We are sometimes told that what is commonly spoken of as the Church of England is in reality no more than two provinces of the Catholic Church. Now as a matter of fact this is formally inaccurate: the Catholic Church consists not of provinces but of dioceses ; that is, of bishops with the clergy and people subject to them. A province is not a division of a larger body, viz. the Catholic Church, but an aggregation of smaller bodies, viz. dioceses ; and the statement to which I have referred above ought to run that the English Church¹ consists of such and such a number of dioceses (the number varies from time to time) within the unity of the Catholic Church. But even so, it is only part of the truth. The English Church does indeed consist of so many dioceses within the unity of the Church Catholic, and in conse-

¹ As distinct, that is, from its daughter churches and the churches in communion with it.

quence it partakes of that life which is common to the whole Catholic Church. But it is not merely so many dioceses of the Catholic Church; it is this and something more. It is a local, particular, or national church, by which I mean that it is bound together by a common life peculiar to itself. In the case of the English Church this common life involves not only its relation to all the dioceses of Christendom; not only the relation of the dioceses of a particular province to one another, and of the bishops to their Metropolitan; but the relation of all the dioceses and all the bishops to one another as sharers of a common history and a common life, connected by links which concern them alone, or concern them in a way that they concern none of the other bishops or dioceses of Christendom. They are linked together by voluntary submission to limitations at the hands of the whole body; by the common acceptance of certain formularies and canons; by the fact of a relation to the State, which is the result not of a concordat, but of a historic growth peculiar to them. The relation which subsists between these bishops and dioceses, in a word, is no merely numerical relation but a historical relation; no merely

logical relation but one which is the outcome of life. The English Church does indeed consist of a certain number of dioceses of the Catholic Church, and these dioceses do indeed make up two provinces; but it is something more than a mere *congeries* of dioceses, or two ecclesiastical provinces: it is a real living entity. It has a real life and character of its own, which has left its record in every page of its history. The man who is unable to discern and recognize this may understand many things: he may be able to study logic; he may be able to understand mechanics; in a perfunctory and wooden sort of way he may even be able to study law; but at least let him keep his profane hands off the study of history, and Church history above all, for he has shown himself incapable of understanding what it means.

With so much by way of preface I pass on to my subject, the limitations within which changes of custom may be made in the Church. As to the possibility of making them, and the duty of making them when it shall be found desirable, the English Church has spoken her mind with no uncertain sound. The Thirty-fourth Article of Religion declares that

“Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man’s authority, so that all things be done to edifying.”

The Prayer Book itself makes a similar claim. It is true that the printers endeavour to dissuade us from reading the part to which I refer, by the use of the smallest type at their disposal; but as one has said, “sometimes a tedious anthem or an inaudible sermon sends us in despair on a voyage of discovery in the unexplored regions of the Prayer Book¹”; and so, it may be, many of us made our first acquaintance with the beautiful preface *Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained*. It may not be superfluous to remind ourselves yet once again of what this preface says:

“Of such Ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the institution of man, some at first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition: some entered into the Church by indiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge; and for because they were winked at

¹ Mr W. O. Burrows in *Church Problems*, ed. by H. H. Henson, London, 1900, p. 182.

in the beginning, they grew daily to more and more abuses, which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have much blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away and clean rejected; other there be, which although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still, as well for a decent order in the Church, (for the which they were first devised,) as because they pertain to edification, whereunto things done in the Church (as the Apostle teacheth) ought to be referred. . . .

“And whereas in this our time, the minds of men are so diverse, that some think it a great matter of conscience to depart from a piece of the least of their Ceremonies, they be so addicted to their old customs; and again, on the other side, some be so new-fangled, that they would innovate all things, and so despise the old, that nothing can like them, but that is new: it was thought expedient, not so much to have respect how to please and satisfy either of these parties, as how to please God and profit them both. And yet lest any man should be offended, whom good reason might satisfy, here be certain causes rendered, why some of the accustomed Ceremonies be put away, and some retained and kept still.”

And here the preface proceeds to give the reasons why some ceremonies were abolished and some retained. Be it observed, however,

that these reasons are all based on expediency: the intolerable bondage resulting from them, the superfluity of them, the obscurity to which they gave rise, and the like. There is not a word to suggest that the English Church lacks power to remove them if it be deemed expedient, provided that they are such as "have had their beginning by the institution of man." This is the only limitation of which the writers of the preface seem to be conscious.

Nor are things otherwise when we turn to the great theologian who best represents the mind of the English Church in the period immediately succeeding that in which this preface was composed. There is a tendency in our day amongst unthinking people to speak disparagingly of Richard Hooker: partly because, writing in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I, he does not happen to speak the language of the reigns of Victoria and Edward VII; partly because we have come to see that his writings cannot be taken as being in all respects an adequate representation of the whole of the Catholic Faith. But when allowance has been made for these, after all, fairly self-evident facts, it still remains true that we have no greater teacher than Hooker; and we may venture to say

without hesitation that the whole of Christendom cannot show many names which can be ranked with his, in the region of Ecclesiastical Polity which he has made his own. What then has he to say on the subject with which we are concerned?

He deals with it in the earlier part of his great Fifth Book. Having in the former books dealt with the principles of his opponents, he now proceeds to lay down certain propositions, or postulates¹ as we might say, which underlie all his subsequent argument. The third of these is that

“All things cannot be of ancient continuance, which are expedient and needful for the ordering of spiritual affairs: but the Church, being a body which dieth not, hath always power, as occasion requireth, no less to ordain that which never was, than to ratify what hath been before².”

He does not indeed in any way under-estimate the value of ancient custom. On the

¹ “It is with teachers of the mathematical sciences usual, for us in this present question necessary, to lay down first certain reasonable demands, which in most particulars following are to serve as principles whereby to work, and therefore must be beforehand considered.” (*Ecclesiastical Polity*, book V. chap. v. 1.)

² *Ib.* V. viii. 1.

contrary, his second proposition is to the effect that we may not

“Lightly esteem what hath been allowed as fit in the judgment of antiquity, and by the long-continued practice of the whole Church; from which unnecessarily to swerve, experience hath never as yet found it safe¹”;

and he further declares that “we should be slow and unwilling to change, without very urgent necessity, the ancient ordinances, rites, and long-approved customs of our venerable predecessors².” Nevertheless, he lays it down quite definitely that “the Church hath authority to establish that for an order at one time, which at another it may abolish, and in both do well³.” Moreover, and this too is noteworthy, he attributes the denial of such a power to the Church of his own day, not to a catholic temper but to its very opposite:

“Our dislike of them by whom too much heretofore hath been attributed to the Church, is grown to such an error on the contrary hand, so that now from the Church of God too much is derogated⁴.”

¹ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, book V. vii. 1.

² *Ib.* V. vii. 3.

³ *Ib.* V. viii. 2.

⁴ *Ib.* V. viii. 4.

In other words, it is the mark of the puritan, not of the true churchman, to deny the power of the Church to make laws for its own members ; and I venture to think that Richard Hooker would have taken up the same position towards the neo-puritans of our own day who, out of an unreal or exaggerated reverence for universality, deny to the English Church of to-day the right to abolish old customs or to ordain new ones. For, be it observed, Hooker is not claiming vague and unreal powers for an imaginary combination of all the churches of Catholic Christendom in his own day: he is claiming for the English Church the power, so far as its own members are concerned, to make new ordinances or to abolish those which formerly obtained in the English Church. They might or might not have prevailed in other churches too ; that did not touch the question, for the English Church only abolished them so far as its own members were concerned, and if they formerly prevailed elsewhere, they prevail there still, so far as we are concerned. This is the whole point of his argument, viz. that the authority of the Church, of which he is speaking, belongs to the English Church, so far as its own members are concerned ; and that it can act,

so far as its own members are concerned, with that great authority.

It would be at once tedious and unnecessary to show in detail, as it might easily be shown, that this is the doctrine not merely of commentators on the Articles, as Burnet and Beveridge¹, Forbes and Harold Browne, but of all the great theologians of the English Church: of Andrewes and Barrow, of Bramhall and Bull, and of the great moderns as well. It is even true of Thorndike, the greatest stickler of them all for the rights of the Church Universal². All alike hold that the English Church, as a true Church of Christ, has and must have the power not only to ordain but to abolish rites and customs of the Church; and not only such as are peculiar to the English Church but others also, provided that they are of human institution. That this is so is too clear to be doubted. But the question which we still have to ask ourselves is, Can we justify this claim? are there any customs or rites of human institution (other, that is, than those which have been ordained by Christ Himself) which the English Church has no power to alter, owing to the fact that

¹ For Beveridge see the Appendix, p. 48.

² See his *Works*, Oxford, 1846, vol. ii. pp. 473-475.

they have hitherto prevailed universally? Is there, in other words, such a thing as a Catholic custom of human institution, which a particular church cannot lay aside, and which can only be abrogated by the consent of the whole Church?

The question before us is not, be it observed, whether it is generally expedient to change old established customs or not; or whether in any particular case it would be expedient. All English churchmen would probably hold with Hooker that traditions "established with that authority which Christ hath left to His Church for matters indifferent" "are not rudely and in gross to be shaken off, because the inventors of them were men¹." And it may be at once admitted that there are some changes which would be so serious in their character that they might be a strong reason for believing that the Church which made them was departing from Catholic principles. That however is not the point. Again, the question before us is not whether it was really wise or necessary to abolish all the rites and customs which were actually abolished in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is merely whether, supposing certain changes

¹ Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. lxxv. 2.

were otherwise desirable, it was possible, in accordance with Catholic principles, to make them. To this question we now address ourselves.

I.

In the first place, it must be borne in mind that the prevalence of local customs is the rule, not the exception. That is to say, differences of custom, wherever they exist, are not the outcome of a deflection from some set standard previously existing, but the natural expression of the religious and social life of the peoples amongst whom they are found. The formation of particular customs is the inevitable result of the existence of a common life among men; and such customs must of necessity exist wherever there is such a common life at all. This was fully recognized by the older canonists. If we are to believe Gratian, local custom began to exist when Cain built cities, and although it inevitably ceased when mankind was swept away by the Flood, it revived with the revival of social life, and was for the first time stereotyped by

Nimrod the oppressor of men¹. However this may be, it is certain that the Church came into a world where local custom already had its place, and adapted itself to human conditions after the example of the Lord Himself. Starting with a fundamental character and certain fundamental principles, its rites and customs have taken their shape from things such as these, by a kind of self-adaptation of the Church to the circumstances in which it found itself. Every student of Church history, for example, is aware of the fact that there existed, in the very earliest days, differences of practice even with regard to such a matter as the keeping of Easter.

The existence of local customs, then, is the rule, not the exception ; and their widespread prevalence is a fact so familiar that it calls for no proof. Moreover these local customs have always found favour in the eyes of the Church at large. They have always been regarded as the natural and proper outcome or expression of those differences of racial character, of national history, of changing circumstances, which are to be found everywhere. Our wise father, Gregory

¹ Dictum Gratiani ad can. *Non est peccatum* dist. 6 (*Corpus Iuris Canonici*, ed. Richter, Leipzig, 1839, vol. i. col. 10).

the Great, seems to have regarded it as a matter of obvious fitness that the English Church, like other churches, should have its own customs; and as we know, he directed Augustine to choose whatever seemed most fitting in the custom of any church, and thus to form a body of customs for the Church of the English¹. It has at all times been recognized that the unity of the Catholic faith is not broken but established in the multiplicity of customs in the same faith; as the same great pope wrote to Bishop Leander of Hispalis (Seville), "Where there is one faith, a diversity of practice does no harm to holy Church²." The rule of Nicaea, "Let the ancient customs prevail," has been re-stated in one form or another again and again, down to the time of the Council of Florence, A. D. 1439, which enacted that "Every one ought to observe the rites of his own church"; and although since then the dominant tendency has been strongly in the direction of uniformity, there has never been any attempt to

¹ Baeda, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. cap. 27. The authenticity of this letter is now universally acknowledged.

² S. Greg. Magn. *Epist.* i. 43, ed. Bened. (ed. Mon. Germ. Hist. i. 41): "In una fide nil officit sanctae ecclesiae consuetudo diversa."

make out that local customs are in themselves undesirable. As a matter of fact, in so far as they are the natural outcome of differentiated life, they are obviously natural and inevitable, as St Anselm said in answer to the question of the abbat Waleran. His words are so much to the point that they are worth quoting in full :

“ Your reverence asks concerning the sacraments of the Church, why they are not celebrated everywhere in one way, but are carried out differently in different places. If indeed they were celebrated everywhere, throughout the whole Church, in one way by common consent, it would be good and praiseworthy. But nevertheless, seeing that there are many diversities which have nothing to do with the substance of the sacrament or its virtue, or with the faith, neither is it possible that all should be agreed in one custom, I think that they ought to be tolerated in peace amicably, rather than to be condemned discordantly and with scandal. For we have it from the holy Fathers that if in the Catholic faith the unity of charity is preserved, difference of custom does no harm. But if it be asked whence are born these differences of custom, from nothing else, I apprehend, than the diversities of human understandings. For those who agree never so much in the truth and virtue of the matter, nevertheless do not agree as to the fitness and

the decency of the outward order. For what one judges to be more fitting another often thinks to be less so ; nor do I think that not to be in agreement in matters of this kind implies any departure from the truth of the matter itself¹."

The Church then is not the poorer for differences of custom, but rather the reverse. As old mystical writers used to say, following St Augustine², the Church is only the more richly adorned because her vesture of gold is "wrought about with divers colours."

The fact of this widespread divergence of local custom is, as I have said, a very familiar one ; but it is perhaps worth while quoting the evidence on the subject of three distinguished witnesses in order to show how they regarded it. There is, in the first place, the well-known advice given by St Augustine to Casulanus on the subject of the observance of local customs:

"I will tell you the answer given to my questions on this subject by the venerable Ambrose, bishop of Milan, by whom I was

¹ S. Anselm. *ad Waleranni querulas responsio*, c. 1 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* tom. clviii. col. 552).

² S. Aug. *Ep.* xxxvi. *ad Casulan.* § 32. Compare G. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, iii. 416.

baptized. When my mother was with me in that city, I, as being only a catechumen, felt no concern about these questions; but it was to her a question causing anxiety whether she ought, after the custom of our town, to fast on the Saturday, or after the custom of the Church of Milan, not to fast. To deliver her from perplexity I put the question to the man of God whom I have just named. He answered, 'What else can I recommend to others but what I do myself?' When I thought that by this he intended simply to prescribe to us that we should take food on Saturdays (for I knew this to be his own practice), he, following me, added these words: 'When I am here I do not fast on Saturday; but when I am at Rome I do: whatever Church you may come to, conform to its custom, if you would avoid either giving or receiving offence.' This reply I reported to my mother, and it satisfied her, so that she scrupled not to conform to it; and I myself have followed the same rule ¹."

Or consider the following statement of the Church historian Sozomen, with regard to the great variety of customs existing in different places:—

"[The fathers] faithfully and rightly concluded that those who agreed in the essentials

¹ S. Aug. *Ep.* xxxvi. ad Casulan. § 32: cf. *Epp.* liv, lv. ad Ianuar.

of worship ought not to separate from one another on account of diverse custom. For similar differences of custom prevail in many churches where the same doctrines are received. There are, for instance, many cities in Scythia, and yet they have but one bishop between them; whereas in other nations a bishop is appointed even over a village, as I have myself observed even in Arabia and Cyprus and among the Novatians and Montanists of Phrygia. Again, there are even now but seven deacons at Rome, corresponding precisely to the number ordained by the Apostles, of whom was Stephen the first martyr; whereas in other churches the number of deacons is not fixed. In Rome, Alleluia is sung but once annually, namely, on the first day of the Feast of Easter, so that it is a common thing amongst the Romans to swear by the fact of hearing or singing this hymn. In that city, too, the people are not taught by the bishop, nor by any one in the Church. At Alexandria the bishop alone teaches the people, and it is said that this custom has prevailed there ever since the days of Arius; who, being but a presbyter, broached a new doctrine. Another strange custom prevails at Alexandria, which I have never seen or heard of elsewhere; and that is that when the Gospel is read the bishop does not rise from his seat. In the same city the arch-deacon alone reads the Gospel; whereas in some places it is read by the deacons; and in

many churches only by the presbyters, while on great days it is read by the bishops; as, for example, at Constantinople on the first day of the Festival of the Resurrection. In some churches the season called Quadragesima, which occurs before this festival, and is devoted by the people to fasting, is made to last six weeks; and this is the case in Illyria and the West, in Libya, in the whole of Egypt, and in Palestine; whereas in Constantinople, and in the neighbouring provinces as far as Phoenicia, it is made to comprise seven weeks. In some churches, again, the people fast three alternate weeks, during the space of six or seven weeks, whereas in others they fast continuously during the three weeks immediately preceding the festival. Some people, again, like the Montanists, fast only two weeks. Assemblies for worship are not held in all churches at the same time or in the same manner. The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere else, assemble together on the Sabbath as well as on the first day of the week; which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria. There are several cities and villages in Egypt where, contrary to the usages established elsewhere, the people meet together on the night of the Sabbath, and though they have previously taken food, partake of the Mysteries. The same prayers and psalms are not recited, or the same passages read on the same occasions in all churches. Thus the book entitled *The Apoca-*

lypse of Peter, which was considered altogether spurious by the ancients, is still read in some of the churches of Palestine on the Day of the Preparation, when the people observe a fast in memory of the Passion of the Saviour. So the work entitled *The Apocalypse of the Apostle Paul*, though unrecognized by the ancients, is still esteemed by most of the monks. . . . What I have said on this subject must now suffice. Many other customs are to be observed to this day in cities and villages, and those who have been brought up to observe them would consider it wrong to abolish them, out of respect to the great men who instituted and perpetuated them ¹."

Or once more, to take a name from a much later period, let us see what the abbat Peter the Venerable of Cluny has to say on the subject. In a famous letter to his friend St Bernard he writes as follows :

"If a mere difference of custom, if manifold variety in an infinite number of things is to rob the servants of Christ of love towards one another, what peace or concord or charity can be left, not only to monks but to any Christians? . . . If, I say, the law of Christ, which is love, is to be abandoned by all who follow different uses, it will simply disappear altogether. . . . Has not, dearly beloved, the

¹ Sozomen, *H. E.* vii. 19.

whole earth long been filled with the churches of Christ? And as the churches which serve God in the same faith and love are almost numberless, almost as great a variety of uses is to be found amongst them as there are churches. You will find this [diversity] in the canticles, in the lessons, in all the offices, in the different vestments; you will find it, too, in the different fasts which are observed in addition to the authorized ones, which are fixed; you will find it in all those things which, according to the differences of times, places, nations and countries, have been instituted by the rulers of the Church. . . . Have all these churches abandoned charity because they differ in their uses? Is the great gift of peace to be lost by all because each one works what is good in a way different from the rest? Not so thought Ambrose, &c.¹”

And so he goes on to quote the words of St Ambrose that I have given above.

II.

Local custom, then, is a thing which exists and grows up in the Church automatically,

¹ See the letter of Peter the Venerable to St Bernard (S. Bern. *Ep.* ccxxix).

as we might say. This being so, it follows that customs tend constantly to increase in number. They grow of their own accord; but they do not easily die away: on the contrary, whilst every fresh religious impulse tends to give rise to some new religious custom, it also tends to revive and give strength to such as already exist. In other words, it is the tendency of customs to grow far more quickly than they decay, so that there is always a probability that they will increase rather than diminish. And it is a fact of experience that this actually happens: customs and rites do actually tend to increase in complexity, and to such an extent that they often become a heavy burden. Already in St Augustine's time this was the case, and he declares that

“the Christian religion, which God in his mercy made free, appointing to her sacraments very few in number and very easily observed, is by these burdensome ceremonies [i.e. those which have grown up without proper authorization] so oppressed, that the condition of the Jewish Church itself is preferable; for although they dwelt in bondage, yet they were subjected to burdens imposed by the law of God, not by the vain conceits of men. The Church of Christ, however, suffers many

things, being so constituted that at the present it encloses much chaff and many tares ¹."

Certainly there was no improvement in this respect later on; and John Gerson, one of the greatest of the theologians of the fifteenth century, inveighs against it in earnest terms. In one passage he records the story of Urban V, who "gloried in that he had been made pope for this cause above all, that he would no longer be liable to the penalties of excommunication and irregularity. And if he had loved his neighbour as himself, and had felt thus," adds Gerson, "he would doubtless have abolished so many snares, so many burdens, so many dangers ²." Elsewhere he points out how the commandments of God are made of none effect through the traditions of men:

"And thus there is made, of the light yoke of Christ and the law of liberty, an iron yoke and a heavy burden, pressing upon the necks of Christians; namely, while they think that all their own laws, their own institutions and rules and statutes, are to be received as precepts of the Law of God, to be obeyed under pain of eternal death. The full list of these traditions of

¹ S. Aug. *Ep.* lv. ad Ianuar. § 35.

² J. Gerson, *De Vita Spirituali Animae*, lect. iv. coroll. 14 (*Opera*, tom. iii. col. 50, Antwerp, 1706).

men, what man can number, in canons of popes, in synodal constitutions of provinces and dioceses, in the rules of the regulars, in statutes of universities, colleges and churches, in edicts of emperors and princes, in bye-laws of popular bodies. Many of which bind under pain of excommunication, others under an oath or duty of fidelity. And if such and so great a man as Adam, being bound by a single law, failed of fulfilling it, how in the world can we escape, who are set in the midst of so many?¹

In our own day, so far as the West is concerned, the burden is doubtless lighter. But it may be questioned whether it is so in the East; and I happen to know that a distinguished Eastern ecclesiastic who was lately in England told one of our greatest scholars that whilst he cared greatly for the purity of doctrine he had no wish that we should ever come to be bound, like them, with a burden of ceremonies which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear.

¹ Gerson, *De Vita Spirituali Animae*, lect. ii. (*Opera*, tom. iii. col. 16, 17, Antwerp, 1706). The whole tract, like every work of this great churchman and large-hearted theologian, is worthy of study.

III.

Plainly, the only way of escape from such a burden is by abolishing some part of the existing ceremonies or customs which are of human foundation. This again would be acknowledged on all hands, at any rate in general terms. There is a recognized maxim which declares that when the necessity which gave rise to any precept has passed away, the obligation of the precept has ceased also¹; and clearly the only way in which this can be acted upon is by a process of express or tacit abrogation. Is there, then, in the nature of things any reason why some customs should be subject to this process and others exempt from it? is there any reason why customs which are merely local should be capable of being abolished whilst those which are general are not?

Once more, I am not dealing with the question of expediency. It is obvious on the face of it that it is a more serious thing to

¹ "Quod pro necessitate temporis statutum est, cessante necessitate debet utique cessare pariter quod urgebat, quia alius est ordo legitimus, alia usurpatio quam ad praesens fieri tempus impellit."—Causa i. qu. i. c. xli (*Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. Richter, vol. i. col. 320).

abolish customs in the observance of which many churches are agreed than those which are peculiar to one church; for there is at least *prima facie* evidence that what has commended itself to others too has something at any rate to be said in its favour. No church can wisely or rightly disregard the mind of the Church at large. Nor, again, am I dealing with the question of motive: even a small variation of custom *may* be an outward sign of a disregard of antiquity, a disparagement of the whole Christian body; in a word, of an uncatholic temper. But that is not the point.

The contention which we have to meet is in a word this: that a particular church may not alter a "Catholic custom," that is, one which has the authority of the whole Church or rests on the practice of the whole Church. It might be sufficient to answer that the very fact of the repudiation of the practice by a particular church carries with it the consequence that the custom does not really rest upon the consent of the whole Church; and I hold that in fact this is actually the truth. But let us look at the matter from another point of view. It is allowed that a particular church may abandon a custom or practice which is peculiar to itself alone. How can

its liberty in this respect be affected by the fact that another particular church has also adopted the practice? or that two others have? or that all the other churches of Christendom have? And once again. It is contended that a custom which has come to prevail throughout the whole Church is thenceforth stereotyped unless the whole Church should happen to agree to vary it. Such a contention practically means that the history of the Church is one of gradually increasing bondage; since it is plain that the difficulties in the way of such agreement on the part of the whole Church are and must be very great. Instead of being a growth into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God, it is a gradual deterioration into merely mechanical and lifeless uniformity; for the further the process goes, the less of liberty will there be.

The Church Catholic, in other words, cannot bind itself; and the particular church cannot lose the liberty which it had in one age because in the meanwhile other churches have adopted the same course of action. Such a thing would not only be contrary to the very nature of the Life in Christ: it is also, as Burnet long ago saw, contrary to the very nature of any true society:

“That the laws of any one age of the Church cannot bind another is evident from this, that all legislature is still entire in the hands of those who have it. . . . The power of the Church is in every age entire, and is as great as it was in any one age since the days in which she was under the conduct of men immediately inspired¹.”

After all, it is the Church of to-day which has to act for to-day. The Church is the heir of all the ages, it is true; it has profited, or ought to have profited, by all the wisdom that has gone before; but it is not the slave of the ages that have gone before, or of circumstances of expediency that once existed and have now ceased to exist.

IV.

But it will often be found that the best way to test some theoretical statement is to submit it to the test by confronting it with undoubted historical facts: so treated, it vanishes at once, as a soap-bubble does when

¹ Burnet, *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*, Oxford, 1796, p. 473. Burnet is here referring to the English Church, not to the Church Catholic.

it is pricked. Let us test our contention in this way, by asking ourselves whether customs which were once universal have or have not been abandoned by particular churches. We need not do it with anything of exhaustiveness, for the facts as a whole are unquestionable.

If, for example, there is any custom at all which can be said to have had the authority of the whole Church behind it, it is that of abstinence from blood, in accordance with the decree of the Council of Jerusalem¹. I believe that it is still observed in the East, but nobody would contend that it is observed in the West. The sending away of all but the faithful from the Sacred Mysteries, once universal, is now extinct almost everywhere. The rule of standing in prayer during the Easter season, laid down by the Council of Nicaea², has completely fallen into abeyance in the West. The practice of infant communion, the mutual kiss of peace in the Eucharist (as regards the faithful at large), the Agape, immersion in Baptism and especially the trine immersion, are on much the same footing. The prohibition of certain trades and occupations to Christians, the

¹ Acts xv. 20.

² Can. xx.

penalties on dancing, and the forbidding at certain times and within certain limits of the use of the bath, all these have been gradually dropped by one particular church after another. The ordination of married men and their continuance in the married life after ordination was once universally allowed; it is now expressly forbidden in the Roman communion, excepting in the Uniat churches. The minor orders, and even the Diaconate as a distinct and separate office, are practically in abeyance everywhere but in the East. We ourselves, as apart from other Westerns, have abolished not one but many "universal customs"; we have dropped, for instance, the use of chrism in confirmation and the use of holy water. Even the unchanging East has not been free from innovations. It no longer prevents any but the faithful from being present at the Eucharist; it insists upon marriage previous to ordination, excepting in the case of monks; and in defiance of the ancient and universal custom by which bishops were chosen freely from among the faithful, it now restricts the choice to monks.

No doubt, many of us would hold that some of these changes were not wholly desirable; but I imagine there is nobody who

would say that they were all *ultra vires*. And in the face of facts such as these (and they are after all but specimens from a list which might be prolonged almost indefinitely) I fail to see how it is possible to contend that universal customs can only be abolished by the act of the whole Church.

V.

And, in point of fact, not a few writers of very high authority within the Roman communion have either admitted the principle that underlies such changes or have actually taught that such changes may be made by particular churches. I am of course aware that such is not the dominant view in the Roman communion at the present day; and indeed it is to this fact that I attribute the current ideas on the subject amongst English churchmen, with which I am at present dealing. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the other view has been very widely held. It is probable that a great deal of additional evidence on the point could easily be found, but the following, which is all that I have had

leisure to look up, may be sufficient for the purpose in hand.

1. To begin with, Gratian lays it down quite definitely that there is a certain "great authority" in the Church, according to which "if some of our elders and predecessors did things which at that time could be done without fault, and afterwards these things were turned into error or superstition, then without any delay and with great authority they were destroyed by those that came after¹"; and he mentions the destruction of the Brazen Serpent by Hezekiah. Here, it is true, he does not say who has power to destroy them; but the fact of the moral necessity at least carries with it the inference that it need not necessarily wait for the action of the whole Church.

2. Gratian lays down this principle repeatedly², and it is accepted by a large

¹ Dictum Gratiani ad can. *Quia sancta* d. lxiii. (*Corpus Iuris Canonici*, ed. Richter, vol. i. col. 210).

² In addition to passages already referred to, see Gratian's comment on the canons *Quoniam* and *Aliter*, dist. xxxi (*Corpus Iuris Canonici*, ed. Richter, vol. i. cols. 99, 100). Here Gratian expressly recognizes the fact that the churches of the Roman obedience do not follow the ancient rule of the Church in the matter of the marriage of the clergy.

number of canonists of later date. Nor is there any doubt in the mind of such writers as to the possibility of setting aside customs resting upon the very highest authority, should there be need. The Spanish theologian Melchor Cano, for example, plainly recognizes the fact that there are customs even of apostolical authority which may rightly be laid aside, seeing that the conditions no longer exist which they were framed to meet¹.

3. Again, the Roman Catholic Christopher Davenport, known in England as Franciscus a Sancta Clara, who wrote his *Paraphrastica Expositio Articulorum Confessionis Anglicae* in 1634, readily accepts the statement of our Thirty-fourth Article of Religion, above referred to. His words are as follows :

“This whole Article, therefore, appears to me most true, and agreeable to the practice of the Church. . . . That which is added at

¹ Melchior Canus, *De locis theologicis*, ii. 18: “Praescribunt autem Apostoli quatenus pro tempore expediebat, quibus illae rebus in fratrum offensionem possint incurrere. Quia igitur lex a fine suo aestimanda est, tunc haec intelligitur abrogata, cum ab illis offensionibus ac dissidiis, quibus occurrere voluerunt Apostoli, nihil amplius periculi fuit” (*Opera*, Bassani, 1746, pp. 77, 78). The whole chapter is interesting.

the end of the Article is most true, and St Augustine says the same (ep. 86 *ad Casulanum*, and ep. 119 *ad Ianuarium*); and again it is to be found, 31 dist. cap. *Quoniam*, &c., and cap. *Aliter*, and is the opinion of all the Doctors¹."

Words could hardly be clearer than this. It may perhaps be urged that Sancta Clara wrote with the object of showing that the Articles could be made to bear a meaning that was orthodox from his point of view. So he was, and this might doubtless need to be borne in mind if the meaning of the Article were in question. But it is not; and there is no real reason to suppose that he would mutilate the doctrine current in his own communion in order to bring it into line with the Article.

4. A writer of far greater weight who can be quoted on the same side is the Spanish

¹ "Totus igitur hic Articulus mihi verissimus et praxi Ecclesiae consonus videtur. . . . Quod autem additur in ultimo articulo, verissimum est, et tradit August. in ep. 86 *ad Casulanum*, et in epist. 119. *ad Ianuarium*, et tandem habetur 31. dist. cap. *Quoniam* etc. et cap. *Aliter*, et est omnium Doctorum": *Deus, Natura, Gratia* . . . *Accessit paraphrastica Expositio reliquorum Articulorum Confessionis Anglicae*. Per Fr. Franciscum a Sancta Clara; Lugduni, Antony Chard, 1634, p. 320 (ed. F. G. Lee, London, 1865, p. 83).

theologian Francisco Suarez, probably the greatest writer of the Roman communion on the subject of Law in general. He not only contends that local customs are not abrogated even by some universal law to the contrary, unless there be some express, or at least some general, revocatory clause¹, but also lays it down quite definitely that a general law of the whole Church may be abrogated by a local or particular church, so far as its own members are concerned; since such abrogation may often become necessary, and it is in many cases obviously impossible that the whole Church should assemble and take joint action².

¹ *Tractatus de legibus et de Deo legislatore*, lib. VII. cap. xx. § 9 (London, 1679, p. 490 b).

² *ib.* VII. xviii. 6; p. 480 a. The whole passage is worth quoting: "Solum video, posse dubitari de legibus Ecclesiasticis latis pro tota Ecclesia; erit enim necessarium, ut consuetudo sufficiens ad derogandum tali legi sit introducta, et acceptata a maiori parte Ecclesiae, hoc autem expectare difficillimum est, et vix potest Ecclesiae constare de tali consensu. Respondetur, si lex universalis pro tota Ecclesia abroganda est, ad minus requiri consuetudinem dicto modo universalem, quia alias non interveniret in eo consensus Ecclesiae absolute loquendo. Et ideo hic modus abrogationis rarus est, non est tamen impossibilis, quia per sufficientem famam, et publicam communicationem per literas et nuncios, potest haec notitia intra quadraginta annos divulgari. Addo tamen iuxta morem Ecclesiae, et canonica instituta, non ex-

5. The teaching of Suarez, that contrary custom may abrogate human law, so far as a particular people is concerned, is in fact that of canonists in general; and the only condition which they lay down is that which had been laid down by Gregory IX; viz. that it must be reasonable and that it must be lawfully prescribed¹. Nevertheless, after their manner, they tend to make the most of these conditions, and to restrict more and more the cases in which laws can be abrogated². Moreover, they introduce by degrees

pectari, ut haec abrogatio simul pro tota Ecclesia universali, et universaliter fiat, sed fieri per partes in provinciis, Episcopatibus, et aliis communitatibus, quae per leges proprias gubernari possunt. Nam si in aliqua ex his communitatibus praevaleat, in maiori parte consuetudo contra legem communem pro illa communitate derogatur, etiamsi pro aliis integra maneat, et ita cessat omnis difficultas. Et cum proportionem potest haec doctrina ad alias leges communes, sive canonicas, sive civiles, applicari."

¹ *Decret. Greg. IX.* lib. I. tit. iv. de consuet. c. ii *cum tanto* (*Corpus Iuris Canonici*, ed. Richter ii. 39): "Licet etiam longaevae consuetudinis non sit vilis auctoritas, non tamen est usque adeo valitura, ut vel iuri positivo debeat praeiudicium generare, nisi fuerit rationabilis et legitime sit praescripta."

² See, for example, L. Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Canonica*, s. v. Consuetudo (Venice, 1783, vol. ii. pp. 537 etc.); and Benedict XIV, *De Synodo Dioecessano*, lib. XI. c. xiv. sect. 10 (Venice, 1793, vol. ii. p. 74).

a new idea of the *raison d'être* of this prevalence of custom ; and it comes to be regarded as a state of things which exists by the sufferance of a supreme lawgiver, or in other words as a kind of dispensation on a large scale. It follows of course that the region within which it can exist is made narrower and ever narrower¹. Nevertheless, the thing still remains, however it be regarded.

6. It has been re-stated in our own day by a modern Italian writer, the canon Salvatore di Bartolo, who actually teaches that universal laws made by the Pope at the present time may be rendered inoperative by contrary custom. In his excellent *Critères Théologiques*, a work which has received the *imprimatur* of a very large number of cardinals and others, he writes :

“All canonists recognize that a law, in order to have obligatory force, must be opportune ; in any universal law which ad-

¹ Ferraris, op. cit. p. 542 : “*Consuetudo rationabilis et legitime praescripta abrogat omnem legem humanam etiam canonicam, ex textu in c. final. de Consuet.* [i. e. the passage quoted above, p. 40, note 2]. *Nefas tamen est episcopo iuxta consuetudinem dioecesis suae contra Canones legem condere ; quod enim valeat consuetudo, est ex quidam tolerantia Superioris Legislatoris. Nimiae autem esset arrogantiae, si Episcopus legem conderet contra legem Superioris.*”

dresses itself to people who differ by education, habits, &c., and who did not live under the same climate, inopportuneness is not impossible. Is it to be supposed, in this case, that the legislator wills to bind those who are subject to him? We, who know the tenderness of the government of the Church, answer in the negative.

This doctrine is upheld by all the canonists, and furnishes a good explanation of that sentence of Gratian, that laws are instituted when they are promulgated, but receive their force when they are approved by being obeyed ¹."

Thus it will be seen that there is no little teaching within the Roman communion itself to justify both the action which was taken by the English Church at the Reformation, and also the justification of that action which the English Church incorporated in the Thirty-fourth Article of Religion.

VI.

To conclude. It may perhaps be gathered that in my opinion the view against which I am contending is the outcome of a mistaken idea with regard both to the nature of

¹ *Les Critères théologiques*, Paris, 1889, p. 319.

authority in the Church and to the nature of the Church itself; and that this mistaken idea, having its origin in a one-sided presentment of things, has found its climax in the Ultramontane party in the Roman communion. Of course, if we conceive of the Church on earth (as apart from the Church beyond the grave) as an organized army, in such wise that every officer derives his authority (or his power of exercising that authority, for my purpose it matters not which) from a single earthly source, and that each is responsible for his actions to a sort of central War Office, then no doubt there is much to be said for the view that a particular church cannot abolish a custom or a rite which has prevailed generally. If we regard particular churches as having no real character or entity, and as being mere fragments of one great whole, then no doubt some such view follows automatically. But we cannot so regard them without robbing them of their essential character, and stultifying all Church history.

Apart from the fact that such a view is essentially that of a mere party, though the dominant party, in the Roman communion, which may or may not be urged in its disfavour, and from the fact that it is unhisto-

rical, which is in every sense to its discredit, it seems to involve two fallacies.

1. It rests upon a conception of the unity of the Church which is that of a machine and not that of a living organism. In a machine it is true, no doubt, that each part can only act within certain mechanical limits, and that the machine as a whole can only act according to one particular method, and that a mechanical one. But it is not so with a living creature. There the whole life, so to speak, is manifested in the activity of each part. Eye and brain and hand, thought and sight and touch, the whole being acts in and through each. So is it with the Church, as St Cyprian long ago perceived. The episcopate is one, and in it each bishop is a partaker jointly and severally. Within his own range, every act of the individual bishop is that of the episcopate in him. Naturally, the joint action of many bishops has a moral force above that of the action of a single one; much more so when bishops act together within a fellowship which is based on past history and common life. But no *new* authority is thereby created: it is still, as it was in the case of the individual, the authority of the episcopate. And so is it with the Church. The Church

is, so to speak, in every part of the Church; and the action of the English Church has for its members the authority of the Church, just as that of the Roman communion has for its members, or of the Eastern churches for theirs. Once more, I have nothing to do at present with the moral weight of particular decisions, but I certainly hold that there is *no other* power behind, for the power is there already.

2. And secondly, it is based upon a fallacious idea as to the meaning of the phrase *Catholic custom*. There is undoubtedly such a thing as Catholic custom, just as there is such a thing as the mind of the Church or the Rule of Faith, in the older and more general sense of that phrase. It would be easy to collect passages from the Fathers speaking of their reverent devotion to all three of these. It is undoubtedly the object of every true Catholic Christian to conform himself to Catholic custom; not, that is to say, to make his life a mechanical copy of something which he can find in precedents of former days, but to live, under the altogether unexampled conditions of these days, and of his own altogether unique personality and altogether new circumstances, in accordance

with the principles and the standards of the Church of Christ. That is surely what the duty of following Catholic custom involves.

But the view which I am resisting uses the phrase Catholic custom in an entirely different sense. It assumes that there are certain customs which, *because* they happen to prevail more widely than others, have a different kind of authority altogether; and that some which prevail universally may on that account be called Catholic customs and regarded as having ecumenical authority. Now I will waive the question which might well be asked, whether there are any customs which can really be said to have ecumenical authority at all, and only say that such a definition of Catholic custom is at once misleading and nugatory. Many will remember that some years ago the late Cardinal Vaughan and the other Roman Catholic bishops in England put forth a most unfortunate *Vindication* of a certain papal Bull. In the course of it they spoke over and over again of "the Catholic rite" for conferring holy orders. It was at once pointed out that there was not, and never had been, any such rite, if by the phrase was meant one which was used in, and supported by the

authority of the whole Catholic Church ; and that if on the other hand the phrase was only meant to imply that the rite in question was used by authority in the Catholic Church, every rite Eastern or Western which is used in the Catholic Church might fairly claim to be a Catholic rite. In like manner here. I admit of course that there are certain things which prevail universally in the Church, such as assembling together for worship, confessing of sins, prayer and praise and reading the Scriptures, and above all the administration of the Sacraments, all of which, be it observed, rest upon something wider and deeper even than the most widespread usage. But whatever may be said with regard to things such as these, which do not really rest upon custom at all, I affirm that there is no set of acts, or rites, or customs, which may together be said to constitute Catholic custom. And further, I contend that every custom which is used by authority in any part of the Catholic Church may fairly be described as a Catholic custom, whether it is in use in England or Italy, in Greece or in Ireland, or anywhere else ; and that it has, for those who are under that authority, the full sanction of the Catholic Church.

APPENDIX

THE TEACHING OF BEVERIDGE. (See p. 14.)

THE passage more especially referred to in the text is that in his *Discourse upon the Thirty-Nine Articles*¹. My friend Mr. Lacey has reminded me, however, and the fact should be borne in mind, that Beveridge propounded a different doctrine on the subject in a Latin sermon preached before Convocation in 1689, and subsequently published, *iussu Episcoporum*, under the title "*Concio ad Synodum ab Episcopis & Clero Provinciae Cantuariensis celebratam; habita in Aede Westmonasteriensi XII. Kal. Dec. A.D. CIOIOXXCIX. Per Gulielmum Beveregium, Archidiaconum Colcestriensem . . . Londini 1689*"². It is not reprinted in his collected Works, but an earlier draft of it is tacked on to his posthumously published *Thesaurus Theologicus*³.

It would be superfluous to discuss Beveridge's teaching fully here, but it may be said, briefly: (1) that the Sermon appears to have been prepared originally at the time of the Popish Plot, and that both its subject and its argument are somewhat coloured by the feeling which that event roused in England; (2) that its language was in some degree modified when it was preached in 1689; and (3) that the real point of Beveridge's contention is that there are "universal customs" of such great value and importance that they cannot rightly be changed by any local church. This, of course, I am in no way concerned to deny. What I contend is that, if there be customs or practices which no church may rightly change, this is the case because of their importance in themselves, and not because they happen, as a matter of fact, to be universally observed.

¹ W. Beveridge, *Works*, Oxford, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, vol. vii. p. 533 f.

² Of this I have seen two separate issues, Brit. Mus. 4477. g. 3 and Brit. Mus. 694. e. 16; they only differ in a few letters, and the former is the earlier of the two.

³ *Works*, vol. xi. p. 474 f.

Loyalty

to the

Prayer Book.

BY

PERCY DEARMER, M.A.,

Vicar of S. Mary's, Primrose Hill.

Published at the request of the Truro Diocesan Conference.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

Or in Cloth Boards, Sixpence.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LIMITED.

OXFORD : 106, S. Aldate's Street ;

LONDON : 34, Great Castle Street, Oxford Circus, W.

1904.

Loyalty to the Prayer Book.

THERE was once a man who wanted to escape from a certain prison : he tried to loosen the window-bars, he tried to work out the stones of the wall, he tried the chimney, and he tried the floor. Then suddenly a happy thought struck him. He opened the door and walked out.

I think the historian of the future will say : There was once a Church that wanted to escape from a great mess. Somehow or other this Church had failed to retain her hold upon her members : the people of the country had for centuries been drifting away from her ; half the religious folk had formed themselves into other denominations ; the great majority of the people somehow had given up going to church at all ; those who remained faithful were, in spite of a great Revival, still in singular ignorance as to the principles of their own religion : as a consequence, many of these were so sluggish as to be a source of weakness rather than strength ; others were zealous, but their zeal was a source of division rather than of the unity which maketh force. So her enemies raged against her ; her own children rushed hither and thither and were not satisfied ; while the nation, through its Parliamentary representatives, became insolent, and proposed to refurbish the rusty weapons of religious persecution for the disciplining of her clergy.

This Church was, in fact, in a mess. She had tried so many ways of escape! She had tried Geneva; she had tried Rome; she had essayed a mixture of the two in varying proportions, which was called Moderate; she had tried *laissez faire*, by which each man did what he found easy and thought nice; she had even tried (heroic and marvellous as it may seem) to establish a Cathedral type of Service in every village church. The one thing that she had never tried to do was to carry out her own laws, and to apply her own principles.

Then one day she had a happy thought. She would be true to her own self, to her own laws. She opened the door, and walked out.

We do not realize the extent of our failure. With everything human in our favour—learning, position, wealth, lofty traditions, the possession of the church buildings, the schools, the universities—we have gradually let our people slip away from us. Goodly was our heritage: if we had but kept what our forefathers had won for us, the whole Anglo-Saxon race would to-day be united in one Church, devotedly attached to it, and most diligent in worship—as our ancestors were 1,000 years ago, as they were 400 years ago, as, indeed, a great majority still were, in spite of many losses, 200 years ago.

1. But how has the Church lost her children? *First of all, by not praying for them.* Twice a day, in every church in the land, the Parish Priest should have called the people together for common prayer and praise. Those were his orders; and he shut the parish church

up for six days out of the seven. I do not see how a Church can expect to have GOD's blessing, when His laws are so flagrantly set at nought. This is the first essential step in loyalty to the Prayer Book. It is the very rudiments of loyalty ; nothing can make up for its loss. We clergy have undertaken to do it. May I add, we are paid to do it ? We are set in our parishes primarily to conduct the daily prayers, to minister the Sacraments, and to tend and teach the people : all our manifold secular activities are of secondary importance, and must not stand in the way of our first duty as Christian Priests. And nothing is more of the essence of the Prayer Book than this ; its very title is *The Book of Common Prayer* ; and Common Prayer is the *daily* use of the Divine Service, nothing less. There is never a word about Sunday. The preface, *Concerning the Service of the Church*, sets down plainly this daily use of the Psalter and the rest of the Bible as the reason why the Prayer Book was published—why, in fact, there was any Reformation at all. That “ this godly and decent Order of the ancient Fathers ” might be restored, that “ the Clergy, and especially such as were Ministers in the Congregation, should (by often reading, and meditation in God's Word) be stirred up to godliness themselves,” “ and further, that the people (by *daily* hearing of holy Scripture read in the Church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of his true Religion.”

The exact opposite to this happened : the clergy did not use the daily Services, and the people became less and less inflamed with the love of true religion.

In spite of a special rubric, in spite of the very title of the Services (*The Order for Morning Prayer daily throughout the Year, The Order for Evening Prayer daily throughout the Year*), in spite of the daily Psalter and the daily Lectionary, the Prayer Book was made inoperative six days out of the seven. Is it wonderful that, as this stream of intercession failed, the founts of religion also were dried up? Is it wonderful that the miraculous Church revival of the last fifty years has been bound up from beginning to end with the revival of daily prayer?

2. *The Church lost her children because she did not tend them.* Pastoral care was shamefully neglected before the Revival, as was to be expected in an age when people were only reminded of religion once a week. I need say no more about this, except that the clergy failed in loyalty to that part of the Prayer Book which contains their own Ordination Vows.

It is, however, well to remember that the clergy does not mean the priesthood only. The work of house to house visiting is intended by the Prayer Book for the diaconate ("to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish: to intimate their estates, Names, and places where they dwell, unto the Curate"—*The Ordering of Deacons*); while for the priesthood is reserved the more spiritual work ("to use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, within your Cures"—*The Ordering of Priests*). In nothing have the authorities of the Church done her greater harm than in refusing to establish a genuine, that is, a permanent diaconate. Devoted women have done their best to supply the want, but without much

real success ; for amateurs and layfolk cannot do such delicate and difficult work, though they can help in visiting in many ways. The Church rightly demands properly-ordained ministers (there is, doubtless, a place for Deaconesses as well as for Deacons), and gives to such Deacons their proper work about the altar and in the church. It is impossible to read the Form for the Ordering of Deacons without admitting that it is men of the excellent type of the Wolverhampton or the Church Army Evangelists that the Church has in view. If the Bishops had remembered this, instead of refusing to admit the existence of vocation outside a small and privileged class, the Church would still be the Church of the people. The refusal to recognise the working of the Holy Spirit in the mass of the English people has driven the more earnest into Dissent, and the rest into indifference.

3. *The Church lost her children because she did not teach them.* As each generation grew up, it was lost to the Church, because the children had not been taught the Christian faith and practice. Things are better than they were : yet, I wonder, in how many parishes are the children really taught to know and love the Faith ? The statistics as to communicants prove that, with all our efforts over the Schools and Sunday Schools, we still fail somehow to teach the one thing needful. We have enormous numbers of children entrusted to us. We lose them as they grow up. If we only kept ten per cent. of them, our town churches would be crowded to suffocation. Now, to say that we lose them is to say that we have failed to teach them.

Should we fail if we kept loyally to the Prayer Book ?

We are given there very definite instructions, based on a thousand years of successful Church teaching; and these instructions we ignore. Let me recall the Prayer Book system of religious education. Soon after a child is born, he is brought to church upon a Sunday or Holy-day (when the church is full of people), and in the middle of Divine Service is baptized: thus the whole congregation is made to feel its responsibility for him, and is also reminded of its own profession. All this vivid education we lose by our system of semi-private Baptism. But this is only the first step. The child has three sponsors, all of whom are required by Canon 29 to be communicants. Observe the educational effect of this, not only upon the child's future (for how can a non-communicant Godparent influence a child to become a communicant?) but also upon the whole body of adults—the working folk who have come to think that Communion is not meant for them.

The sponsors are told to see to three things¹:—(1) That the child shall be taught to be present at Holy Communion, for he has to “hear sermons,” which, according to the Prayer Book, are only preached between the Nicene Creed and the Offertory. (2) That the child shall be instructed in the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Sacraments—not in the Old Testament and the Kings of Israel, and Huppim and Muppim, but in that body of necessary Christian doctrine and practice which is so admirably presented in the Catechism. In practice as well as doctrine. If the English Church has failed to respond to the highest ethical and social needs of the people, so that

¹ Exhortation in the Administration of Public Baptism.

it has been found necessary to create a Christian Social Union to remind her members of their duty to their neighbour, is not this also due to a failure in teaching the Catechism, which contains, as members of that Union are always saying, all that is needed to remove our social evils, with their attendant greed, immorality, misery, and irreligion? I think those of you who have endeavoured to teach, really to teach this theology—really to make it part of a child's mind—will agree with me that there is little time for anything else but the Catechism, if it is to be properly explained and, of course, illustrated from the Bible. But how is it to be taught? Is this most difficult of all subjects to be relegated to people who are necessarily unskilled, for the most part, in teaching, and unversed in theology—the Sunday School teachers? While every other subject is taught by experts, is this one alone to be left to amateurs? No! “The Curate of every Parish shall diligently upon Sundays and Holy-days . . . openly in the Church instruct, and examine.”¹ That is the Church's method. The Parish Priest is to do it, and not on Sundays only, but on some thirty-five other days as well. Once more, this is his solemn duty. He is appointed to do this, and not to let other things crowd it out.

I have tried it for some years past, and I find that the Prayer Book is right; that by this regular catechising one can make the children not mere nominal Christians, drifting to nothing as they grow up, but conscious, keen, devout Churchmen and communicants. I have found, too, that the catechising on Holy-days supplies

¹ First rubric of the Catechism.

just what is wanted in making the young realize the Christian year, the full story of the New Testament, and the lessons of the Saints ; while, incidentally, it has drawn the adults to Evensong (for they love to hear the catechising, and learn much from it), and has made our Holy-days to be far better observed.

But this is not all. The sponsors are given a third instruction. (3) They are to present the child for Confirmation while he is still a child, not waiting for that dangerous age when so often Confirmation is too late ; but to bring him "*so soon as*" he knows his Catechism. The point is again enforced in the third rubric of the Catechism ; and it is certain historically that the "competent age" of this rubric is much nearer ten than fifteen. As the Prayer Book says, more than once, it is "children," and not youths, who are confirmed.¹ The boy, that is, when he goes to work or to a public school, is already a communicant : he faces the great change of his life, strengthened by Confirmation, fed by Communion, and with the habits of the Christian life engrained in his being. Of such a child, so brought up and so fortified, it will not be true, as it so often now is, that his first Communion is his last, or that he never gets so far as Communion at all.

Yet the Church provides one further safeguard, most culpably ignored by us. This same third rubric of the Catechism says that "everyone shall have a Godfather, or a Godmother, as a Witness of their Confirmation ;" and we know from the old rubric which this continues, that the Confirmation sponsor should not be one of the Baptismal sponsors. Just consider what an

¹ *E.g.*, Last rubric of the Catechism.

opportunity this provides us with. One of the men in your Communicants' Guild is told off to look after a boy who is being prepared for Confirmation—and, mark you, this provides just that incentive to active responsibility which our adults need so much. The boy goes to his Confirmation accompanied by this sponsor, who acts as a father to him; and we know the enormous influence upon a boy's imitative nature of a grown up man, we know how essential it is that he should feel that he is taking a step in manliness. After the Confirmation, this new Godfather's duty is to pray for the boy, to keep an eye on him, and have him round to tea and keep friends with him (an easy thing to do), and to see that he makes his Communions.

This brings me to another rubric, which is often brought up as a crushing evidence of the impracticability of the Prayer Book. I mean the rubric which says that intending communicants must "signify their names to the Curate, at least some time the day before." Now, the Curate has no power to *repel* fit communicants, and therefore the rubric does not lay an impossible duty upon him. His duty is simply to ask for the names of communicants. Can he not do this? Can he not gradually restore this custom, first at Easter (as is already done in very many churches), then at Whitsun day and Christmas? and, I would suggest also, on Dedication Sunday (the first Sunday in October), or at Michaelmas. In this way, at least he has the names of communicants four times in the year. On the Sunday before these four occasions he fulfils another forgotten bit of the Prayer Book by reading the long Warning from the Communion Service. He will have already told his children

at their Confirmation that they are to make their Communion at least on these four occasions. (Nay, he will have made them solemnly promise, before presenting them to the Bishop at all, saying, "I could not present you for Confirmation unless I felt sure you meant to be communicants.") Later on he will encourage them to increase the frequency of their Communion.

Now, they are reminded by this Warning, their Confirmation sponsors are reminded too. (Incidentally, the whole congregation is reminded by the reading of this Exhortation, that there is such a thing as private Confession in the Church of England, and that this Confession is not compulsory, but is laid solemnly upon the conscience of every Churchman to decide for himself whether he need it or not. Half the prejudices of the Church "crisis" are due to the fact that most Churchmen never hear the Warning read.) To resume. As the names come in, they are written on slips of paper and put into a box at the end of the church: thus the parson finds out if any have dropped off; and he goes at once to stir up the laggards. As years pass by, and his children grow up, this custom of giving notice becomes more and more valuable. It can easily be made weekly, by regular monthly and weekly communicants giving notice every year once for all. In any case, it enables him to keep in view the spiritual life of an ever-increasing number of full Church members. Should we lose our communicants as we do, would the proportion of communicants be an infinitesimal proportion of the population, as it is,—if we carried out these plain directions of the Prayer Book? My Lord, I venture to think that we fancy these directions to be impracticable, only

because we have not yet fully recovered from the terribly low standard of pastoral care which our fathers have bequeathed to us.

This brings me to the fourth cause of failure. I have spoken of our neglect to carry out the Prayer Book, in praying for our people, in tending them, and in teaching them.

4. *We have not fed them.* Of the past three centuries it is too true that the hungry sheep looked up and were not fed. If the world had fed their bodies as niggardly as the Church has fed their souls, the physical results would have been as bad as the spiritual results now are. Ah! but, you say, the days when the Holy Communion was celebrated once a quarter are passed. Yes, they are. But the days when the Holy Communion is made the principal Service of the Lord's Day are yet to come. And I do not see how we can expect the fulness of GOD'S blessing while we neglect the honour due to the act which He told us to do.

The Prayer Book is quite clear about this. And our divergence from the Prayer Book is equally clear. There is (the 45th Canon tells us) to be one sermon a Sunday; this sermon, the rubric says, is to be preached in the Communion Service.¹ The Reformers were anxious to restore preaching: they, therefore, to ensure a good congregation, ordered that a sermon should be preached every week, at the time when (as they fondly hoped) the whole parish would be gathered together. They also ordered the notices to be given out at this time, and the Banns of Matrimony published, which last order has been, by an act of flagrant lawlessness, expunged by

¹ Second rubric after the Nicene Creed.

the printers from the Communion Service. Now, to disregard these rubrics is to turn the whole system of public worship upside down. It is not a small matter, touching some ceremonial detail: it is a large matter, affecting the very essence of Christian worship. Would our people be so unsacramental, so weak in worship as they are, if this plain order had been obeyed? And, remember, it is amply safeguarded. The Priest has no right to leave off at the Prayer for the Church Militant unless there is a dearth of communicants, and there will be no dearth if the people have been taught the inestimable privilege of partaking of the Lord's Supper; nor has he any power to interpolate a blessing, so as to allow non-communicants to go out. The rubrics before and after *Ye that do truly* suppose the presence of non-communicants; the Baptismal Service orders the presence of children; two Canons (the 18th and the 90th)¹ forbid people to leave during the Service; and the rubric before the Blessing states clearly that it is only then, at the end of the Service, that the Priest or Bishop is to "let them depart."

The ideal of the Prayer Book, then, is plain. On Sunday morning, people are to come to church for the Holy Communion, and to hear the sermon. Preparatory to this Service is the Litany, which is the Anglican preparation for Holy Communion, and ought not to be misused: to shift it to the afternoon or evening is to do a grievous wrong to the meaning and order of Divine Service. Some time before the Litany, Mattins is to be said or sung.

Now, I know, of course, that in thus summarising the

¹ Code of 1603.

Prayer Book ideal as to the Eucharist I have raised a host of difficulties in many minds. In country parishes we have a bad un-church-like tradition inherited from slothful times, and it is useless to give our people the full meat of the Prayer Book all at once. But what I want to suggest is that while it *is* our duty to educate our people *gradually* up to the Prayer Book standard, and not in country places to try for the ideal all at once, at the same time, in this gradual process one should be careful to stick ever closer to the rubrics, and to keep the ideal clear before ourselves and our people. We suffer much from arousing a suspicion that we have some private, mysterious, and illicit end in view. We should make it quite clear what our ideal is—what we know we *ought* to do—and at the same time make it clear that we would not disturb good people who have been brought up in other ways. In restoring the observance of the Prayer Book, our whole strength, and our certainty of success, lies in our showing all men that we do desire to carry out the orders of our Church,—not allowing any private fads (even in small matters) to obscure our devotion to principle. The people of England will rally to the call of duty. It is not their fault that they have not heard it before. Loyalty and duty have been the strength and glory of our public life, of our soldiers and sailors, our judges and doctors. The appeal to duty stirs all that is best in the nation. It will not fail in the Church. Let it only be tried.

I do not minimise the difficulties. They will need much wisdom and patience. But they will be lessened if the clergy will stick to principle, and not estrange their people by meaningless trivialities. A real enthusiasm

for the Prayer Book standard will steadily reduce all obstacles. In many town parishes it is possible at once to place the Eucharist and sermon at 10 or 11, and to precede it by Mattins and Litany. And this has been done with success in some country parishes. In some places local feeling would make this impracticable; but, where this is so, I do not think a regular 8 o'clock Eucharist, with Mattins and sermon at 11, is a wise plan: it stereotypes the existing evil. When the Priest is single-handed, it is better to have an early Eucharist once a month only, and to have a sung Eucharist every Sunday at a later hour, say 9.30. The devout communicants will come to this, and a generation of young people can be brought up to the same practice: it thus becomes possible, as the parish is educated, to transfer the sermon to its proper place in the Eucharist, and after a while to place Mattins and the Litany before it. But all changes should be frankly explained beforehand, and the reason (loyalty to the Prayer Book) clearly given; while at the same time everything strange in the manner of celebrating (such as private prayers and gestures which the people cannot follow) should be rigorously eschewed. Such things do not help to raise the Eucharist in the eyes of the people. They lower it.

The Bishop of Salisbury has suggested that Mattins should be at 9, followed by Litany and Holy Communion. This is ideal, and in several parishes it has been already successfully realised. In some such gradual way as I have ventured to suggest it should be ultimately possible everywhere, especially if the Bishops help the

clergy by charges such as those of the Bishop of Salisbury. It would be ideal to have the Services thus early, for it would get over the difficulty of fasting Communion, and, at the same time, it would secure the High Celebration as a Service of the Communion of the people. For, let us always keep in mind that non-communicating attendance, though lawful, and for small children necessary, is not the ideal either of the Primitive Church or of the Prayer Book. The weekly attendance at Communion of adult communicants is not the ideal, though it can be a valuable stepping-stone towards the ideal, which is that every adult communicant shall receive the Holy Sacrament on every Sunday and Holy-day.

Surely, it is of paramount importance to restore the almost atrophied virtue of worship. The curse both of our religious and our secular life is that we do not worship Almighty God, that we are so largely hearers and not doers of the word,—hearers of sermons, hearers of ornate music; and consequently sluggish, without initiative, without devotion, without the fire of intimate love. It is, I venture to think, obvious that, to restore the genius of worship (once an instinct of our people), we must stick to the Bible and the Prayer Book, and thus restore the Eucharist—the great Evangelical Service—to its lawful place. But in so restoring it, we must restore also that clothing of lawful ceremonial, which is so expressive, so essentially popular, because so intelligible in its dramatic simplicity. Who can deny that, by the neglect of this ceremonial during the past two or three centuries, we have failed to make the Lord's own Service understood by the people? If

they had understood it, they would never have ceased to love and frequent it. Even the great gain of having the Service in our mother tongue has proved useless, because our fathers forgot the other means of making it intelligible. Who can deny, galling as the admission may be, that it was better understood in Latin, with an expressive ceremonial, than in English with a blank one? We have a Liturgy which for sheer beauty of language is unsurpassed in Christendom. Yet this splendid opportunity, which the Reformers gave, has been wasted.

Well, it may be said, but we have altered all that. See how bright our Services are! My Lord, I know this "brightness," and I very much doubt if it has made the Prayer Book more understood of the people. I see everywhere a "bright" Mattins, intoned by Priests wearing the same vestments as those in which they celebrate, and culminating in the Eucharistic sermon, the Eucharistic offering of alms upon the Altar, and the Eucharistic blessing, in churches where the Eucharist has been celebrated—without any brightness—early in the morning for some half-dozen worshippers. And I do not see in this any approximation to the Prayer Book order; on the contrary, I see in it an attempt, if an unconscious attempt, to make the people contented with the preface instead of the thing itself, to satisfy them with that which is not bread. I see the Sunday Evensong rendered with the same Eucharistic accessories, made unpalatable to the average man by ornate and unsingable music, and also brightened by the same sacramental stole, but never brightened by Holy Baptism as the rubric directs, never relieved after the Second

Lesson¹ by the catechising which another rubric orders, which would release the country Priest from the impossible task of preaching two *good* sermons a day, and which, believe me, can be made as delightful and instructive to the adults who listen as to the young people who answer. In towns, this catechising at Sunday Evensong might be devoted to the elder boys and girls (who at present are allowed to forget the little they ever learnt), the Children's Catechism being taken at an earlier hour.²

Let us by all means have bright Services, if by that we mean singing in which everyone can join, if we avoid the temptation to make our Services dull and without significance, through perpetual monotoning, if we secure real brightness by clear and stirring reading of the Lessons—"distinctly with an audible voice"—and by short and

¹ The Prayer Book, true to the principles of psychology, always places the sermon, instruction, or address, soon after the lessons and *before* the principal prayers. This will be noticed, not only in the Eucharist and at Evensong, but also in the Occasional Services, as, *e.g.*, in the Communion, in the Visitation, and also in Confirmation, which begins with a short address, and sends the children quietly away after the last prayers without any anticlimax in the way of preaching. The Marriage Service ends with a homily (or sermon), and abruptly, because the Holy Communion ought to follow, if possible, "at the time of their Marriage." In the Baptismal Offices the Gospel is followed by an Exhortation "upon the words of the Gospel," though another Exhortation is added at the end for the special reason that the initiatory rites are not complete.

² This Sunday evening catechising after the Second Lesson is of especial use in the country; but it can, I believe, be done with great success in towns also. A large number of nominal Churchmen, especially amongst the working classes, go to church in the evening; and the opportunity of giving them definite teaching—not, of course, childish teaching—is invaluable. The effect upon the clergy, too, in having to read theology for this purpose would be excellent.

vigorous sermons, and by interesting instructions; and if we remember to make the highest Service the brightest of all. Let us, in fact, bring out the real brightness of our Services by doing them proper justice.

And, if we are to have ceremonial, let us remember that it becomes worse than useless when we rob it of its meaning. I can only account for the still common practice of wearing coloured stoles upon every conceivable occasion, by supposing that the clergy have not yet sat down to consider why they do these things. Certainly there is no justification for it in the Ornaments Rubric, which strictly limits the stole to the Sacraments; certainly not in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., which mentions the surplice, cope, and vestment, but does not mention the stole at all.¹ The essence of the matter is that the Priest should wear a special dress for the Holy Communion, in order to show how different this Service is from the others. Our grandfathers forgot that: they wore a perfectly correct choir habit, which had come down to them from the Middle Ages—a long surplice, a hood, and a black scarf: their mistake was that they did not change this dress before they went to the Altar. We shall make a great error if we give up this choir habit of surplice, scarf, and hood, which is a valuable witness to

¹ Many Priests imagine that the use of the surplice and black stole proclaims them to be "moderate" and loyal, having, apparently, an idea that this is the use of the Canons of 1603. The truth is that the stole is not mentioned in the Canons at all, though the cope is. In the first Prayer Book it is implied as part of the Eucharistic "vestment," but not otherwise. The use of the stole with the surplice (and then only for Sacraments) requires that literal interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric, which restores all the ornaments of the early years of Edward VI.

the continuity of the English Church. We shall make the Services of the Church less meaningless, if (obeying the Ornaments Rubric) we do not put on a stole until we go down from the chancel to take a Baptism; and if for the Holy Communion we wear that special vestment which is clearly ordered, even by the lowest interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric.

“But,” it may be said, “these things have brought trouble upon the Church.” My Lord, it is not faithfulness to Prayer Book directions that has brought trouble upon the Church; it is unfaithfulness. In every case of what are called “ritual disputes” that I have known, there have been violations of the Prayer Book, there have been acts of private judgment, and too often there has been deliberate copying of the Church of Rome in defiance of our rubrics.

No doubt it is possible that a man might carry out the letter of the Prayer Book, and yet, by want of tact, by unsympathetic haste, or by want of pastoral diligence and friendliness, might fail; or through the un-Christian crankiness of some exceptional squire might be hampered. But one can only speak for sensible men; and then I would remind that the old-fashioned lawful choir habit reassures people considerably, and that the legal vestment for Holy Communion can be made of plain white silk and need not necessarily be decorated even with orphreys; nor, may I add, be of that debased shape which makes the wearer resemble a sandwich man. It is not the thing itself that offends: it is the manner of the thing.

People have taken such a strange delight for fifty years past in accentuating party divisions by “high” or “low” eccentricities of ceremonial, that we are apt to

forget how unnecessary all this is. A Service may perfectly well be at once Catholic and Evangelical by conformity to the Prayer Book; and there are many degrees of elaboration which may be conscientiously adopted. For instance, a Celebration of the Lord's Supper may be made "advanced" and "very high" (if I may be allowed the popular nomenclature) by the use of coloured vestments for the Priest and his assistants (including the Clerk), of copes, of frankincense, and so on. Or it may be "moderate," the Priest wearing, let us say, a white silk chasuble, and having only a Deacon or a Clerk to assist, while there are fewer lights, no incense, and not much ceremonial. Or it may be "low," without a cross on the altar and no lights on it, so long as there is one lighted candle somewhere near; and the chasuble may be the simplest linen thing imaginable, and there may be no intoning, and the preacher may wear his black gown (though this is rather sacerdotal) if he likes. All these variations would still be within the Ornaments Rubric, and faithful to Catholic tradition; for they would be variations of style, not of principle. And in many parishes something of the plainer sort is really needed, especially when the Eucharist is first put into its proper place as the principal Service. I feel assured that in the near future all sensible men of whatever party will in this way approximate more and more to the Prayer Book standard, and will find that by so doing they have drawn closer to one another than used to be thought possible.

Above all, we have to make it clear that, whatever we do, we honestly do it because we want to be loyal to our Mother Church. People will respond to that. And

we have to make it clear that we are not trying to Romanise, even in little things. We talk of these things as little, but how often is it some quite unimportant and meaningless trifle that causes our brother to offend? And, as regards the integrity of our position, do we sufficiently remember that one practice, or ornament, which we have imported from another Communion on no authority but that of our own fancies, deprives us of all right to say, "I do this because I am a man under authority, and my duty is to obey the law?" If we claim the Ornaments Rubric for what we do, we must be clear that this claim is honestly made: the use for instance, of the cotta—a small matter, indeed quite literally a small matter—is important for this reason, that it can only be defended by an appeal to private judgment, an appeal which can be used with disastrous results by the opponents of all Catholic principles. We must be clear, too, that we are equally conscientious in other matters; that we, for instance, celebrate the Eucharist according to the prescript form, and not according to our own private fancies as to what would be a nice Service.

May I briefly mention another instance? We are told by the Prayer Book that the chancels shall remain as in times past. The clergy are the guardians of many chancels of priceless beauty; it is for them to see that they keep them as the Prayer Book directs. A flight of steps behind the altar, with a row of candles, is not only fatal to the beauty of an old Gothic church, (because such churches, being designed for an altar without gradines and with a different arrangement of lights, are always spoilt by an attempt to fit them up in the Italian fashion),

but it is also a standing witness to anybody who may come into the church that our ornaments are not those prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer.

These are surely not matters to be made light of, though they are on a plane of importance far beneath that of the daily Services or the position of the Eucharist; for plain men do judge us very much by the concrete evidence of our ornaments, and the strength of a chain is in its weakest link. There is, of course, a danger here of pedantry and antiquarianism: to say this is only to say that there is a need of scholarship and of the historical spirit, here as necessarily in all matters of liturgiology, or, for that matter, of theology or politics or art. For the scholar may be small-minded and lapse into pedantry; the historian may shut his eyes to the broadening lessons of history, and forget in antiquarianism the needs of present times; but it would be foolish indeed to make this an excuse for neglecting sound learning and being blind ourselves. The English Church happens to base herself in a special manner upon history—she appeals to the Scriptures and primitive antiquity for her theology,¹ to the ancient Fathers for her ritual,² to Catholic tradition for her ceremonial;³ she refers us to the second year of Edward VI. for her ornaments,⁴ and to the later middle ages for the arrangement of her chancels.⁵

¹ *E.g.* Articles VI., VIII., etc.

² *E.g.* The Preface *Concerning the Service of the Church*, Article XXIV., etc.

³ *E.g.* The Preface *Of Ceremonies*, Canon 30 (1603), Canon 7 (1640), etc.

⁴ The Ornaments Rubric.

⁵ "And the chancels shall remain as they have done in times past." (First inserted in 1552.)

Her formularies, therefore, cannot be understood without a good deal of historical knowledge. Some people may object to this, and may ask—Why should they be bound by documents that are two or three hundred years old? But the fact remains that they *are* so bound, whether they like it or not; and that the whole intention of the Reformers, as shown from end to end of the Prayer Book, Articles, and Canons, was to bind them to principles that are nearer two thousand than two hundred years of age. Nor will they be released from this bondage to historic continuity till the same authority that imposed it shall have removed it,—which will not be for a long time to come. The attempts that have been hitherto made at throwing off this light yoke have not been so conspicuously successful in their results as to encourage us to proceed. Therefore I ask Churchmen to renounce those futile experiments of private judgment, and to throw themselves into the task of realising in its entirety that sound Catholic ideal which the defenders of the English Church preserved for us through the most troublous period of her history. I ask them, not only on the ground of authority, but also because experience has shown that the manifold antinomianisms of many generations are, as the Preface says, “either of dangerous consequence (as secretly striking at some established doctrine, or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ) or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain.”

Such, my Lord, are the main reasons why I believe that in loyalty to the Book of Common Prayer lies “the

solution of the present difficulties of the English Church." I have but touched on a few of the main issues, leaving the details to be taken by my hearers on trust. Yet, before ending, I would briefly guard against three misconceptions.

1. Loyalty to the Prayer Book does not bind us to think it perfect and incapable of improvement. In many ways it might be altered and made even more excellent than it is. But our business is not with that. Our business is to carry it out loyally—to make the very best of what is, in any case, very good. A soldier generally criticises the methods of the campaign in which he is engaged. Nevertheless, he obeys his orders.

2. Loyalty to the Prayer Book implies a sound interpretation of that book: it does not, for instance, exclude the use of hymns, etc., or oblige us to use all the Prayers after the Third Collect every day, or the Prayer for all Conditions more than four times a week, or the Long Exhortation and Warning at every Eucharist.

3. Loyalty to the Prayer Book, like loyalty in every other part of the Church in every period of history, allows the use of additional Services so far as shall be enjoined or allowed by lawful authority. The work that I have been privileged to do in helping to edit a new Altar Book, with additional Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, shows that I am the last to desire any limitation of the possibilities of devotion. The Prayer Book is not exclusive; no Catholic Office Book ever is: additional Services are indeed a mark of a living Church. The Prayer Book was never intended to be exclusive, as is fully proved by the 250 pages of additional public

prayers and offices reprinted in the Parker Society's volume of "Liturgical Services of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth."¹

I set up no fetish. I ask nothing more than the general adoption of the Catholic principle of order. Nor do I ask for this loyalty without having made certain experiments myself. I have found that the Prayer Book works amazingly well, that it has removed many difficulties, and supplied just what was wanting. And why? Not because there is anything miraculous about these formularies; but simply because they

¹ *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.* Edited by W. K. Clay. Parker Society. 1847. The additional Services and Prayers, which include a Latin Office *In Commendationibus Benefactorum*, and a Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for a funeral Eucharist (*Celebratio Cœnæ Domini, in funebribus, si amici et vicini defuncti communicare velint*), extend from p. 432 to p. 695, and cover the years 1560 to 1601, the last being a prayer for the Queen composed by Whitgift the day before her death. In 1603 the Bidding Prayer was revised and made part of the Canons. In 1606 the Service for Nov. 5th was issued. The 2nd Canon of 1640 recognised the Accession Service, which, in one form or another, has been used in every reign since the Reformation. When in 1661 the Prayer Book reached its present form, it was followed (in 1662) by the special offices (with Collects, Epistle, and Gospel) for Gunpowder Treason, King Charles the Martyr, and the Restoration, none of which are in the Book Annexed (*i.e.*, in the Prayer Book), though they are referred to in it. To the Accession Service was added the Prayer for Unity at the Accession of George I. The first three offices were removed, 1859, by the same authority that had annexed them to the Prayer Book; that for the Accession was finally revised by Convocation in the present reign. Other Services to be found in old Prayer Books are that commemorating the Great Fire (which was not entirely discontinued till 1859), and that for use at the Healing for the King's Evil, which appears in some Prayer Books between the reign of Charles I. and the year 1719.

embody the wisdom of a thousand years, carrying on the results of the whole experience of Christianity in England, from its first conversion; because, though modified in many ways, they retain the essential features of the old Church system, the system that built up the religion of Christendom, whereas other devices have only brought confusion and loss.

One of the shallowest objections to this claim for loyalty is that it is "insular," the idea being, apparently, that to be really Catholic one must pick and choose on one's own authority as the fancy takes one. I need hardly remind you that if loyalty to the prescript order be insular, then insularity is the key-note of the Roman and Eastern Churches. If English Priests had stuck to their formularies as Romans and Easterns have to theirs, then the English Church would to-day be as marked as the Roman or the Eastern Churches are by such practices as frequent Services, fasting, the supremacy of the Eucharist, and the use of distinctive vestments for the Sacraments. Those who still fancy that obedience is insular would do well to consider seriously what alternative they have to propose. They will find that the only alternative is anarchy, under which each parson may set up his own ideas of Church order and worship; and these ideas have persistently differed, not in details only, but in essentials, from the principles of the Church Catholic. By this system, or want of system, you may have a pseudo-Romanism in one parish, a pseudo-Puritanism in another, and a decorated worldliness in another, but in few will you have Catholic worship and order. Nor will you gain the respect or trust of the rest of the Church or of the world at large. The man

of the world will accuse you, as he does, of doing one thing when you have undertaken to do another: the Papist will say, as he does, that your Church is no Church because it can only attain a mock Catholicism by flaunting the plumes which you have borrowed from him: the Puritan will use the law-breakers on his own side to claim that the English Church is but an unjustly privileged sect; and the law-breakers on the other side, will give him, as they have given him, the opportunity of stirring up the narrowest and bitterest prejudices in the country. But loyalty to the Prayer Book disarms the enemies of the Church, at the same time as it restores the effectiveness of her friends. And if we set—as we should—the fortunes of the Church Universal above those of our own communion, we shall still do well to remember that the weakening of Anglicanism would remove the greatest agency which God in His providence has left in the world for the reunion of Christendom.

My Lord, and brothers, I see everywhere signs of a new spirit of loyalty and devotion. I see a desire to get away from the old party spirit which made a tribal badge of the very cut of a surplice, the very shape of an altar. I see thinking men convinced on all sides that the mimetic methods of the past were suicidal, convinced now against that fatal weakness for copying first Geneva and then Rome, and often both together, which has destroyed our self-respect as well as our pastoral efficiency. We are beginning at last to be proud of our part of the Church, and to live up to its standard. We are beginning to recover that unity of spirit, that enthusiasm of loyalty, which will enable us to regain

the ground we have lost, and to arise to the vast opportunity which the Anglo-Saxon race has spread before the Anglican Church.

And not our race only, but the whole world, will need in the near future that message which we can deliver. The religious need of all civilised people is coming to be this—a pure Catholicism, reasonable, liberal, orthodox, faithful to the essentials of historic Christianity, beautiful and intelligible in its worship, glorious in a rich simplicity. We have feebly followed too long: it is time that we led. It is time that we showed before the Nonconformists of our own race, and before the Christians—both Catholic and Protestant—of other nations, the ideal of that pure, primitive, and reasonable Catholicism which our Prayer Book Articles and Canons assert to be the ideal of the English Church, and which will be a sore need of the world before the present century has passed.

The English Church is on her trial. It is full time that her children rallied, uniting themselves in a common loyalty to her laws. She has to regain her own lost children: she has to help the cause of Christendom throughout the world, drawing the sundered Churches together, proclaiming the forgotten ideal that once made Christendom strong and one.

And only this is needed: that to herself she should be true.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

“Is ‘Ritual’ Right?” Price Twopence.

A. R. MOWBRAY & Co. LTD.

“The English Liturgy, with additional Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for the Black Letter Days, and for special occasions.” Edited by PERCY DEARMER, W. H. FRERE, and S. M. TAYLOR. With a Preface by the Bishop of Rochester. Two Guineas.

RIVINGTONS.

“The Parson’s Handbook.” (On the Management of the Parish Church and its Services.) 5th edition. 6s. net.

GRANT RICHARDS.

Workers together with God.

A Series of Papers on some of the Church's Work by some of the Church's Workers.

Edited by the Rev. NATHANIEL KEYMER, M.A.

Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. $7\frac{3}{8} \times 4\frac{7}{8}$ inches. 428 pp. Cloth, 3/6 net; Cheap Edition, 2/6 net.

Devotional Instructions on the Eucharistic Office of the English Church.

By the late GEORGE RUNDLE PRYNNE, M.A.,
for 54 years Vicar of S. Peter's, Plymouth.

$5\frac{1}{8} \times 3\frac{3}{8}$ inches. viii. + 120 pp. Cloth, 1/- net.

The Ceremonial of the English Church.

By the Very Rev. VERNON STALEY, Provost of
Inverness Cathedral.

$6\frac{1}{8} \times 3\frac{7}{8}$ inches. viii. + 268 pp. Paper, 1/- net; Cloth, 1/6 net.
Best Edition, Cloth boards, 2/- net.

On the Reverence due to the Altar.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor's Treatise. Rendered into modern English, with the addition of Notes and Appendices.

By the Very Rev. VERNON STALEY.

$6 \times 3\frac{3}{4}$ inches. 98 pp. Cloth, 1/- net.

Studies in Ceremonial.

Essays illustrative of English Ceremonial.

By the Very Rev. VERNON STALEY.

$4 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ inches. 264 pp. Cloth, 3/- net.

Memories of a Sister of S. Saviour's Priory.

With a Preface by Father Stanton, S. Alban's, Holborn.

$7\frac{1}{8} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$ inches. 462 pp. Cloth, 3/6 net.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LIMITED, OXFORD;
AND 34, GREAT CASTLE STREET, OXFORD CIRCUS, LONDON, W.

Pusey House Occasional Papers

No. II

PREPARATION FOR
HOLY ORDERS

I. THE PREPARATION OF A GRADUATE
FOR HOLY ORDERS. BY THE REV. J. O.
JOHNSTON, M.A., PRINCIPAL OF THE THEOLOGICAL
COLLEGE AT CUDDESDON, AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE
LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD

II. PREPARATION FOR HOLY ORDERS
DURING UNDERGRADUATE LIFE. BY THE
REV. V. S. S. COLES, M.A., PRINCIPAL LIBRARIAN OF
THE PUSEY HOUSE, AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD
BISHOP OF ST. ANDREWS

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1901

All rights reserved

Price Sixpence

PUSEY HOUSE PAPERS

No. I.

DOCTRINAL STANDARDS : Two Lectures delivered at the Pusey House in the Autumn of 1897, by R. C. MOBERLY, D.D., Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. *Crown 8vo, sewed, 6d.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

I.

The Preparation of a Graduate for Holy Orders

By the Rev. J. O. JOHNSTON, M.A.

THIS paper is not intended to be a discussion of the many wide questions connected with the education of all the clergy; it is concerned only with graduates.* There is, and always will be, a large number of clergy (I trust that it will not be a growing number) who have not had the privilege of a University education. Their training for Ordination presents its own interesting and difficult problems; but with them this paper is in no way concerned. The preparation of those who have completed their University education by taking the B.A. degree is a matter of more immediate importance to Oxford.

Here in Oxford, and especially in this House, it surely can be nothing but a truism to say that the training for an Oxford degree is not of itself a sufficient preparation for Holy Orders. It is a most excellent general education, and it trains some of the most valuable members of every profession; but of itself it is not an adequate preparation for any one of them. With regard to some of them—law and medicine, for instance—this has always been admitted; and the rules of these professions necessitate further special education. Only very recently has it come to be understood at all generally that the clerical life also ought not to be entered without a similar preparation; and even now,

* The paper was read, through the kindness of Mr. Johnston, in the Lecture Room at the Pusey House.

astonishing as it sounds, the regulations which are laid down for candidates for Ordination do not always require that a candidate who has taken his degree at Oxford or Cambridge shall have had any further special education. Twenty years ago the majority of Ordination candidates took those regulations quite literally, and attempted nothing beyond what was compulsorily demanded of them : perhaps there are a few even now in the same state. It is certainly possible for an undergraduate who wishes to be ordained to have some such plan as this : he will take Moderations as early as possible in his University course ; in the next term he will be present (perhaps in body only) at the lectures of two Theological professors ; and, when he has taken his degree, he has only to produce a few testimonials of character and pass an easy examination in order to be ordained. This is possible, although, I trust, it is rarely done now. But that it should be possible at all, is only the result of University changes which have not as yet been met by any corresponding change in the regulations for Ordination candidates.

It may be worth while to explain this point, for some people regard the demand for the special training of the clergy as a new-fangled idea. Within living memory the compulsory religious training of all the members of the University, whether they were about to be ordained or not, was much higher than it is now. Fifty years ago every undergraduate was supposed to receive instruction in the Bible and in the Thirty-nine Articles, and to be generally supervised by the College authorities as regards his conduct and religious habits. In some cases the College rules required every undergraduate to receive the Holy Communion at certain times. Some such training was universally assumed, but the efficiency of the instruction and of the supervision varied greatly at different colleges. Traditions of the excellence of some of the Articles lectures still linger in some memories ; while, in another instance, the Gospel lectures ran little above the level of exercises in formal logic. Still it was taken for granted that every man received a grounding in the Bible and the Articles.

In addition to this it was necessary then, as it is now, that every member of the University who was a candidate

for Holy Orders should attend the lectures of two Theological professors ; but in those days no one was allowed to attend these lectures until after he had taken his degree, and was able to present a strong testimonial of good character from the head of his College. The professors' lectures were, therefore, a compulsory post-graduate course in theology for candidates for Ordination.

The present University arrangements have removed the instruction in the Old Testament and the Articles entirely, and left only the very scanty portions of the New Testament which are required for the Divinity part of Moderations. And, beyond that, the compulsory professors' lectures are now rarely, if ever, taken as a post-graduate course of study. They were first thrown open to undergraduates who had passed Moderations, in consequence, I believe, of the establishment of the Honour School of Theology. (The first Theological Class List was issued in the summer of 1870.) This alteration removed the only regulation which made any theological study after the degree a necessity. About the same time boys began to leave school later than before ; the age used to be sixteen or eighteen, now it tends to be nineteen or even later ; so that there is no longer in many cases that interval between graduating and Ordination which would naturally be devoted to preparation for the work of life.

It can only be through ignorance of all these changes that any one could suppose that post-graduate preparation for Ordination is any new idea. The novelty really is in the present lax state of things. And all who care for the future of the Church are thankful to notice that the Bishops realize to what an extent the changes which have taken place in the University since their own undergraduate days, have lowered the level of Theological knowledge which was in their time taken for granted in the case of any Oxford graduate. It cannot be long before even the possibility of such a position as I have been discussing will have entirely passed away.

But supposing it granted that a degree is not a sufficient qualification of itself : a man may still claim to be adequately prepared without any special training because of some other qualifications. He may, *e.g.*, have a very great longing to

preach and help souls ; he has had this great zeal for years, and he cannot bear to have his life's work postponed any longer ; or he may have a great delight in Church services and in the ritual that he has carefully studied ; or he has already done some parish work of various kinds and will not go about his duties as a deacon like a novice ; or he has had some experience of the work of charitable relief as organized at a University or College settlement in East or South London. Will not this additional qualification suffice ?

All these are, indeed, very useful and valuable ; but not even the best of them, the earnest desire to work for God in the Ministry, is sufficient. It is often very hard to convince a person, who thus feels the Divine call within him, that such a call does not mean that you cannot discard all other considerations and go to work immediately. Moses found this when he murdered an Egyptian, and delayed for years the deliverance of his people ; so did Uzzah when he rashly put out his hand to steady the ark ; so did St. Peter when he nearly committed murder in the garden. There are always calamitous results of undisciplined zeal. In what other profession (and God calls to every one of them) would such a claim be listened to for a moment ? For instance, we all admire, and perhaps almost envy, the volunteers and the yeomanry who are now gone to South Africa. Their patriotic zeal is beyond all praise ; but it is not the only qualification for being placed in the field of battle. Everybody knows that the brief training that they had in barracks was absolutely necessary, but all too short to make them well-disciplined soldiers ; but, under the circumstances, it was all that could be given. Yet I know of one such volunteer (I dare say there were many others), who, in his fiery zeal, complained greatly of the delay ; he had not volunteered to be trained, apparently, he had offered to go to the front. I think that we shall all admit that, even at a crisis, his position was not quite wise ; in ordinary life it would be absurd. Zeal of itself is no complete qualification for Ordination, although it is indispensable.

But it may be urged that a degree in the Honour School of Theology comes much nearer the old standard, and

fully prepares a man for Ordination. Certainly that School has been a very great stimulus to the study of theology, and I have no intention of criticizing it as a theological course. Admitting its value in this direction, it will be no disparagement to the Theological School to say that it does not accomplish an end for which, in its present form, it was never designed.

We must distinguish carefully between the theologian and the parish priest; a parish priest may well be a theologian, but a theologian is not of necessity fitted to be a parish priest. They have, indeed, both of them to deal with the same Revelation, but they have to handle it in entirely different ways. The Theological School is designed as a training for one who is to be (after many years of post-graduate study) a theologian. It is not designed as a preparation for pastoral work, and it does not in the least adequately prepare for it. For what is the necessary theological equipment for pastoral work? The parish priest must, as a matter of *heart* knowledge, know about God, His existence and His attributes; about Jesus Christ, His Incarnation, teaching, atonement, resurrection and ascension; about the Holy Spirit, the Church, the Sacraments; about repentance and forgiveness, faith as the self-committal of the soul of God, and good works as the evidence of that self-committal. These, at least on their simpler sides, are the rudimentary truths which every newly ordained deacon ought to be able to teach intelligently. As time goes on and experience grows, he will have to enter into all of them more deeply. But how very little of all this is taught in the Theological School! A man who takes a high class in it has a good knowledge of some Old Testament books, and of Old Testament theology, of two Gospels, of the Epistles—critically, historically, and exegetically,—and, most probably, of the Doctrine of the Incarnation, one short period of Church history, and a short apologetic subject. These are perhaps known with a minuteness far beyond what is required for ordinary parish work; but they in no way qualify a man to teach that knowledge which a priest's lips must always keep: about repentance and faith, sin and holiness, about the Saviour, the Church and Sacraments.

Hence it is that when a man who has taken honours in Theology comes to Cuddesdon, he may of course be excused the simpler lectures on introduction to the Old and New Testaments, but we find that out of the sixty lectures on Christian doctrine which all students have to attend in the year's course, he must, in spite of his University training, still attend all but four. His previous education has not touched the subjects with which the other fifty-six lectures are concerned, except incidentally. The two courses are so entirely different; the one, as I say, is a special training to form a theologian, and the other is a general training for pastoral work. In the earlier days of the Theological School it was different; its course was then a general one, and when I went through it myself, in 1879, I had to take up all sides of Christian doctrine, and all periods of Church history, and all forms of Christian apology. Of course we did not then make a minute study of each subject, we were only required to show a good general knowledge of theology. In the present system, however, which came into force less than twenty years ago, this fulness of general information is sacrificed to minuteness of knowledge in a few central portions—a change which greatly improved the school as a prelude to a study of theology, but made it quite inadequate as the only preparation for ministerial work.

What then, beyond all that has been mentioned, is requisite for a graduate if he is to prepare himself for Ordination? His University life ought to have given him breadth of view and an ample general development of faculties and interests. Now it is necessary for him to begin his special education; but in this case it is not merely a fresh stage of education on the same lines, it is education of a different kind.

Before Ordination, it is absolutely necessary that a young graduate shall already have learnt, by personal experience, the meaning and value of the Christian faith. Like any other truly religious layman, he must have a strong, clear, moral and spiritual understanding of it, in all humility and earnestness. He must not only know that there is a God and a Saviour, but he must know somewhat of the meaning of the Psalmist's words, "O God, Thou art my

God": "save me, O God." The whole of Revelation must, in a very true way, have already begun to be a living reality to his soul. God, sin, the Cross, conversion, forgiveness, life in Christ must be to him the truths that in his ministerial life he must try to make them to others. The time immediately before Ordination will not be the actual commencement of this realization, any more than death will end it. But it may well be that during this period knowledge of God will deepen rapidly, and His grace will be realized so vividly that the words of St. Ignatius on the threshold of his martyrdom are felt to be true, "Νῦν ἀρχομαι μαθητῆς εἶναι."

A young man who is nearing his Ordination must indeed take care that these essential foundations of the life of all Christians shall be laid deep and strong within him; and for this purpose he will need special help. But this is not all: he has also to form habits which would be somewhat in advance of his years if he were about to remain a layman. He has to acquire what the experience of years brings more slowly to others: an *habitual* sense of the due proportion of things, and a certain permanent balance of mind. He must already have adjusted the whole of his life to the habits which suit the Christian profession, and have unlearned whatever is contrary to it. This cannot be done in a moment, or in any surroundings. Time is needed to form such habits. Again, some real help is needed to deliver him from the rush of excitements and interests that have swept him along as an undergraduate. This does not imply any condemnation of the occupations from which he has to disentangle himself. They may have been quite good (they are not always so, and in such cases the argument for disentanglement is quite unanswerable); they may have been quite consistent with the life of a good layman; but a clergyman is not merely a good layman in ministerial office, any more than an officer in the army is a civilian on military duty. Each needs a special training for special work. A clergyman has much work to do which does not fall to the lot of his lay brother. Among other forms of work he has to stand the continual drain of preaching and teaching; he has to move in scenes of suffering, sickness, perplexity, and sin, to minister to the sorrowful and the dying, bringing at

every moment out of the treasure which is God's and yet his, things new and old: the old truth of the Christian revelation, ever new for each new emergency. For strength in this work he needs through all his life to spend more time than others in the presence of these truths, to understand their meaning and their endless resourcefulness; and before he undertakes the work, he must pass through a period which has some kind of resemblance to the training of the Twelve before Pentecost, or to St. Paul's two years in Arabia.

This claim for a time of retirement must not be interpreted as an insistence on that complete seclusion from the world, which is in the popular mind generally connected with the words, "Roman Catholic seminary." Isolation is one thing: retirement and detachment, while still in relation to an abundance of the best outside interests—such as can be enjoyed at Wycliffe Hall and at Cuddesdon—are very different. Complete isolation may make a clerical caste; but no such result follows from a prolonged period in which the most vital religious interests are allowed the first place in a man's heart, and thought, and life, while he is still in touch with the best of his old friendships and interests, although safe from the interruption of every casual talker and every form of time-consuming amusement. "Be still, and know that I am God."

But for one who is to be a clergyman in the Church of England there is a definite form in which this spiritual experience is to be obtained. He is to be a minister of the Catholic Church in one of its many national forms. Is it not true that most graduates, the fur of whose hoods is yet white, know very little of what the Church of England really is? As public school boys, and as undergraduates, they have had little consciousness of any distinct Church system to which they belonged. The teaching, both in school and college chapels, generally deals with the moral aspect of religious duty, and vacations have so many engagements that Sunday services often represent the utmost of their acquaintance with their parish churches. They have little idea that the Church in which they want to be ministers, presents them with a distinct system of life and with a system of teaching. Before they enter on this work,

they must, if they would be truly loyal, put themselves to school in the Church of England. They must learn to live the Prayer-book; living among others who are really trying to do so, and surrendering themselves to be moulded by the discipline of the Church's services in their full course. For the parish clergyman must know, not from somebody's commentary on the Prayer-book but by experience, what the daily prayers of the Church and her frequent Eucharists mean; he should understand the regular domestic life of the household of God (so to speak). He has to know what Sunday is, and what Easter and Whitsuntide, what Lent is meant for, and the reason of the Friday's observance. He must be spiritually fashioned on the deep and sober wording of our collects. These things the Church of England enjoins quite definitely, and he must feel that in her commands there is an authoritative voice which has a rightful claim on his unhesitating obedience.

It may be (some people say that it is so, and so they, and not I, am responsible for the remark); that some of our Church's formularies speak with stammering lips. It may be that what is taken for a stammer is a double "No," which has to be said to two permissible forms of ritual, each of which wishes to extirpate the other, or to two opposite forms of false teaching, both of which are unwarranted deductions from known truth. But, apart from the positions which are not clearly defined, there is a great central position of practice and doctrine on which our Church has quite clearly expressed her mind, and where she rightly claims our loyal allegiance. And of this position my experience tells me that a young graduate, as a rule, knows but little, nor does he understand its value as a discipline for thought, or as an expression of religious life. This is what every kind of Theological College, by its regular services, aims at teaching. And herein, by the way, lies what I delight in regarding as one of the great grounds for hope that these institutions will be allowed by God to make a great contribution towards the reunion of the Church in this country. The diversity which our Church allows is part of its historical character and the results of our national history. But the bitterness of the warfare among us in the Church is, to a certain extent, the result of ignorance of the fact that the Prayer-book has

a definite history: it is not possible to claim it as the exclusive possession of any party in the Church. It was purposely drawn up to be, within certain limits, comprehensive. In the middle of the sixteenth century our Church definitely excluded a good deal that was merely mediæval, at the end of the sixteenth century it refused to include a narrow Calvinism. In the middle of the seventeenth century it refused Congregationalism, at the end of the seventeenth century a lax latitudinarianism. Avoiding these abysses, she occupies undoubtedly, and intended to occupy, a large table-land, wider than exactly suits the wishes of any one class of disputants within her. Within this area she purposely allows diversity on some points, among those who are equally loyal to her history and obedient to all her main positions. Our divisions (as distinct from our diversities) are chiefly caused by those who, whether as clergy or laymen, instead of being the disciples of the Church, form their opinions for themselves or borrow them from outside, and then try to find a place for them, either against the actual teaching of our Church or against the evidence of her history. The fruit of calm, deliberate study of our Prayer-book and its regular devotional use will be a growing union amongst us. I have noticed of late, in a marked way, how much nearer a high churchman and a low churchman become to one another when they have both been trained, separately, in the discipline of the regular worship and in the doctrine of our Church, at good Theological Colleges of their own views. Before, they only saw their differences and exaggerated them: afterwards they feel their common ground, and understand where they differ, and why, and know that they are both equally loyal. Theological Colleges of different schools are said to stereotype our divisions; it is not true, or, if true, not necessarily true; they do stereotype our comprehensiveness; but so long and so far as the teaching in them is Anglican—not Roman Catholic, and not merely Protestant—definite while allowing variety, not merely latitudinarian—they will draw their students together, for they will teach them the limits of the Church's comprehensiveness, and the good reason for mutual regard and toleration within these limits.

“We may rely upon it,” it has been wisely said, “that

using one language, the language of their spiritual mother, in their daily devotions, having withal a studious leisure in which to judge what is her mind expressed therein, and being about to take upon them a solemn vow to hold and teach it accordingly, they can scarcely arrive at any very divergent conclusions."

There is, however, yet another most important point in a graduate's preparation for Holy Orders which is often entirely overlooked, though very generally necessary. Any allusion to it admits of being readily ridiculed, as most other good things do. I allude to the absolute necessity of a training in those external habits which are suitable to a clerical life. If a man wishes to be ordained, he must, by his outward conduct suggest to the world that he is a disciplined character ; that to him life is real, and life is earnest. He must show his disciplined character in a disciplined life : he must be *σεμνός*. I do not refer merely to a narrow view of *σεμνότης*, as implying only gravity of demeanour, but to what the word can mean in its widest sense. A boy is carefully disciplined in rules and methods at school, but frequently only a few fragments of that discipline have survived the four years of undergraduate freedom, as it is called. For undergraduates are a privileged class ; they are allowed liberties with themselves which are impossible either earlier or later in life. We do not blame them for taking them ; we have come to regard it as their right, so long as they are in *statu pupillari*. But in clerical life these things must be laid aside. A person who is ordained to the Apostolic Ministry who rises late, and begins his day's work about the time that a labouring man thinks of his dinner ; who, habitually unprepared, rushes into church at the last moment before a service should begin ; who is irregular in everything, cannot be relied on, leads an armchair life, has a dawdling manner, a strolling walk, and a perpetual lounging attitude ;—well, he is an official who is neither a man nor a follower of the Apostles. A parish clergyman must be prompt, punctual, alert, prepared for every call, recollected, full of his duty—what in a soldier is called "smart." Some graduates have to learn these habits, and unlearn these defects. The period of life when they are permissible is passed from them ; and the change of dress at Ordination

will not of itself make the reformation. The combination of clerical costume with the slackness and casualness of undergraduate life is a most unseemly sight.

This is not merely the grumbling of an old-fashioned formalism. The outside world does not appreciate clergy of that kind. It cannot respect a man who is always teaching that time is a preparation for eternity, and yet who yawns and saunters through life with his hands in his pockets and a pipe in his mouth, as if nothing were serious or ever made any difference.

For this training, where it is necessary, time and retirement are again needed.

Besides all this, there is the study that is necessary. An ordination examination is but a very slight test of what a graduate ought to know. It may be as much as can reasonably be expected of some of the clergy who have not had the advantages of a University training; but the theological knowledge of a graduate should be of a wider range. He must be trained to be orthodox without being polemical. He ought to have studied carefully introductions to both Old and New Testament, and have read the whole of his Bible in the light of the best analyses and other helps which he can get. Several special books he will have carefully to study in detail. He must study all sides of theology: he can hardly do it alone, even when reading the best books; he will want some one to guide him, and of whom to ask questions in difficulties. A system of lectures, followed by a mutual examination of lecturer and student, is the best course. I have already hinted at the various subjects which must be included in the distinctly doctrinal portion of the education.

Then must follow the reverent study of the Prayer-book in the light of the best liturgical knowledge, and of a careful investigation of the history of the movements which influenced the transition from the use of Sarum to the 1662 Prayer-book. At least, a rapid survey of *all* Christian History and an acquaintance with some of the forms of Christian apology must be added.

And all of this work has to be done as part of a life of devotional regard to God. Prayer ought to begin each piece of work, and the recollection of the presence of God should accompany it throughout. The information is to be sought

from God through His books, as it is to be apprehended and used through God's Spirit for God's work. This alone is to be a theologian—*Pectus facit theologum.*

In this hurried sketch of a graduate's preparation for Ordination several points may have been omitted, but my aim was to dwell on those important aspects of this complex process which many men are apt to neglect. Perhaps I had better say quite frankly that I am myself a convert to this position. One and twenty years ago, when I was at the threshold of my Ordination as deacon, I held a view about preparation for Ordination which no doubt is still held by many who are now able to fix the date at which they hope to be ordained. I was convinced that it was absolutely necessary that every one who offered himself for the work of the Ministry, should have had some preparation for it, and that in some ways the preparation should have been a lengthy one. Like most other people, I thought with myself that I had had that preparation. For as many years as I could remember I had hoped to be ordained; for about ten years I had been working in different ways with a view to it. For the first half of those ten years I had worked in a large Government office with about three hundred and fifty other clerks; and the experiences of my own life and a wide acquaintance with others in such a large society had taught me invaluable lessons about the fundamental needs of human nature. During that time I had also done some parish work and some reading of classics and theology, and had a general acquaintance with ecclesiastical matters, as I then understood them. For the second half of those ten years I had been at Oxford, reading first for my degree in the Honour School of Literæ Humaniores, and afterwards for the Theological School. At that point I considered that I had completed my preparation, and might offer myself for Ordination. This I did, and was accepted. I found no difficulty in getting the necessary testimonials of character, and in passing the Ordination examination, and was then ordained. In the first week of my work in my first curacy I began to discover my mistake; and found myself involved in many difficulties from which, as I can now see, a more special preparation would in a great measure have saved me. I can never be sufficiently grateful that I was able to make up for

that mistake by a prolonged training two or three years later. But that was an inversion of the right order of things, and I would most solemnly warn any graduate against entering Holy Orders without the special preparation which is now within his reach. The best students that come to Cuddesdon invariably say at the end of their time, "I cannot imagine what I should have done if I had not come here;" and they add, "How can any one, who can in any way manage it, venture to be ordained without going to a Theological College!"

II.

Preparation for Holy Orders during Undergraduate Life

By the Rev. V. S. S. COLES, M.A.

It is, I think, a point on which those who have had occasion to consider it are for the most part agreed, that the Preparation for Holy Orders in the Church of England is too short. A year, or even two years, after taking the B.A. degree, is a far shorter time of preparation than is provided for by the rules of other religious bodies, or by the profession of medicine. No doubt the cause of this shortness of definite preparation is to be found in the assumption, for which probably no sufficient ground has existed for several generations, that the University training is itself a preparation for Holy Orders. Certainly, the best remedy is that the subject of preparation should be considered during their undergraduate career, both by those who have made up their minds to seek admission to the Ministry, and by those also who may be considering the matter. It may happen that men are often deterred for want of a clear view of what the candidature and the preparation means.

It is in the hope of being of service in this way that the present attempt is made to consider the true conditions of vocation to Holy Orders, and of the needful preparation.

Since it is the Divine method to work on man by man, and since the Christian religion assumes that all its members will be under pastoral care, it is plain that a great increase of clergy is needed in England apart from mission work,

at home and abroad, and it is hard to see how any member of the Church of England who wishes to do God's work in the world can fail to consider at least the possibility that he may be called to the Ministry. Of course it does not follow that he will decide that he is so called. There are three reasons, at least, why he may find that he is not.

In the first place, he may not be free; his conscience may have been clearly convinced that the call lies for him in another direction. The inclinations of a true, faithful, devout heart, though they ought to be sifted, must not be disregarded; and the wish for a life of medical work, a drawing to the law, or the army, or the strong wish of parents in such directions as these may represent a real call. Gifts fitting a man for educational work, for art, for study, for administration, though they are less incompatible with the life of a priest, may sometimes stand in the way. Lastly, a man who starts in life without inherited means, can scarcely—in view of existing circumstances—conceive that he is called unquestionably both to marriage, or at least to early marriage, and to Ordination. The call to the married life is sometimes a very definite and sacred call, and if a man believes himself to have it, that surely is a conclusive sign that he is not also called to a profession in which custom requires that he should associate on equal terms with the rich, and in which, nevertheless, £150 a year is as much as he can feel sure of securing. It is not only those who believe that they can best serve their brethren by a celibate life who are often called to enter upon the ministry without the certainty of being able to marry prudently; and the clergyman who remains free for some years after his Ordination ought not to be thought inconsistent if he seeks marriage when circumstances have made it prudent to do so.

Again, a man must be not only free, but fit. And here we are met by one of the great Christian paradoxes; the most fit will hold himself to be least fit. "Dicendo se indignum præstitit dignum," says St. Augustine of the centurion. The ancient prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Gideon, Amos, have left us sincere expressions of a sense of unworthiness which is found still in those who are least unworthy. It was not when Moses trusted that his brethren would

understand that the Lord by his hand would deliver them, but when after disappointment, humiliation, and exile, he asked that any one but himself might be sent, that his great mission prospered.

It is therefore no mere commonplace, but plainly the most practical thing that can be said in connection with preparation for Holy Orders, that a man must trust for fitness, not to himself, but to the grace of God. If any one is to be made fit, it will be only by an action of his Maker, as distinct and definite as that of creation.

But as creation is in harmony with all other Divine acts, and exhibits the mark of Divine order and law, so the great gift of grace which enables us, is attended by other gifts—bodily, mental, spiritual—which must be considered before a man can claim the laying on of hands which is to crown them. It is sometimes a cause of surprise to one who sincerely desires clerical service, to find that sufficiently good health is among the subjects of inquiry by the bishop to whom he applies. Yet the condition of a clergyman, who, being dependent on his profession, finds himself cut off by weak health from its effectual exercise, is a very painful one. Under ordinary circumstances the pastoral office involves considerable exposure, makes a perfectly regular life far from certain, and makes great demands upon the nervous system.

Moreover, work which consists so largely of personal intercourse with other persons of various kinds, is greatly impeded by eccentricity of voice or manner. Such hindrances may be remedied by care, and balanced by other gifts and capacities; but their consideration by the bishop should be looked upon rather as a protection to be welcomed than as a grievance to be resented.

The testing of these gifts is not left to our own judgment. The assistance we receive in this matter from authority is the moral side of the doctrine of the apostolic or episcopal pastorate in the Church. However much lax custom may have obscured the true theory, it is certain that the selection of men for the Ministry is properly the function of the bishop. A man is not a candidate for a particular curacy, but for Holy Orders. The bishop may, and sometimes does, accept him as a candidate for the diaconate, before

he has been nominated by any parish priest to be his assistant. And it is the bishop who is responsible for his fitness. As to knowledge, the bishop ascertains this fitness through his examining chaplains, represented in the Ordination service by the archdeacon. But it is not only on behalf of the bishop that this examination is made; the archdeacon and his deputies, in this matter, represent the Church. It is not possible for the bishop to confer Holy Orders upon any man, according to the prescribed form, unless he receives the public assurance, that after inquiry and examination, the candidate appears apt and meet for his learning and godly conversation to exercise his ministry duly.

Besides, and previous to this immediate examination, the bishop requires testimonials of character during University residence, and from three beneficed clergymen for any time which has elapsed since residence. Finally, notice of the candidate's intention to present himself must be given in his parish church six weeks before the Ordination, with a requirement that objections to his fitness be made known to the bishop.

A long habit of submitting to examinations, where the object may fairly be held to be that of merely satisfying a prescribed test, sometimes tends to make a candidate for Holy Orders forget that, in this case, the bishop's inquiries and judgment of his fitness are not an ordeal to be passed, but an assistance to his own pre-supposed desire to test his real fitness for a tremendous responsibility. If a man has loyally endeavoured to lay himself, as he is, before the appointed judgment of the bishop, he will have a real satisfaction in knowing that he has not been a partial, or, on the other hand, a morbidly scrupulous judge in his own case, but that he has sought Divine guidance through its appointed organ.

Thirdly, a man may be free, and may be accepted as fit by authority, and yet something more may remain to be ascertained. The first test was almost entirely negative: it asked, "Is there any hindrance?" And the answer sought was, "There is none." The second was also largely negative. But a positive test must be added: the spirit of the volunteer, the enlisting soldier, the novice eager for initiation—how shall it be summed up better than by saying that a man

must not only be free and fit, but must be genuinely, honestly—and, in spite of occasional depression, on the whole—happy in the prospect of his Ordination? *Χαίρειν* is the true word of congratulation, and its source is the repeated salutation in the liturgies, “*Dominus vobiscum.*”

This last test of the anticipation of happiness in the work passes into a higher and more mysterious, though most real qualification, the consciousness of an inner Divine call. To find that he is free, fit, and happy in prospect of Holy Orders, may be summed up in the words of the prophet, “Here am I.” Something more is asked for by the brief prayer which follows, “Send me.” As the gift of faith transcends all intellectual arguments, so the gift of vocation transcends the fulfilment of the necessary conditions.

Assuming, then, that a man is conscious of a true call, the next point in preparation seems to be—the prospect itself. What is it? What is a man looking forward to? In what way will it be a change? What is the essence of being a clergyman?

These are questions which greatly affect the preparation.

No one can read the service for the Ordination of Priests without seeing that, if it has any meaning or truth at all, it is a great and awful act. Even though the ordaining bishop and the ordained man should alike have persuaded themselves that no divinely guaranteed act is taking place, the forms sanctioned by the Church, even in their barest and minimized form at the beginning of the Reformation, make an unquestionable claim to present the priest, as a priest, to those who recognize his office as of apostolic and Divine authority. Mr. Keble has expressed the true idea of Ordination—

“A mortal youth I saw
Nigh to God’s Altar draw
And lowly kneel, while o’er him pastoral hands
Were spread with many a prayer;
And when he rose up there,
He could undo or bind the dread celestial bands.
When Bread and Wine he takes
And of Christ’s Passion makes
Memorial high before the Mercy-Throne,
Faith speaks, and we are sure
That offering good and pure
Is more than angel’s food to all whom Christ will own.”

And yet it would be a mistake to think that, in its deepest meaning, Ordination is a new departure. It is not a new service of a new master, but only a new way of serving Him.

Did not experience prove the contrary, it might well seem superfluous to say that the seeking of Holy Orders, is not a turning round from the wrong to the right path in life, but a new stage in it. The great distinction is not between the layman and the cleric, but between him who serveth the Lord and him that serveth Him not. The distinction between the things of Cæsar and the things of God does not mean that the things of Cæsar do not belong to God, but that some things are recognized as His, with special emphasis and consecration, as firstfruits, patterns, pledges for the rest. The Lord's Day is not kept by way of a compromise for a godless week, nor is our ordained life a substitute for a Christian boyhood and a holy youth. The special duties will bring with them special opportunities and special helps, but they spring out of the same truths and motives as those which affect every living man.

It is significant that the Ordinations all find their place in the service of the Eucharist, that of deacons after the Epistle, that of priests after the Gospel, and the consecration of bishops at the Offertory. Great as these acts are, they are enshrined in a greater act: they come only as incidents in the supreme act of Holy Communion. It is no exaggeration to say that it is a greater thing to be a communicant than to be a priest; and Ordination, like every other part of a Christian life, is only a new way of preparing for its highest and most characteristic expression in the reception of the Sacrament.

It is then as a Christian man, already claiming his place by faith and obedience in Christ's Body, that the candidate for Holy Orders comes before the bishop to offer himself, as for all service of Christ, so specially for that Ministry to which he believes himself to be called; and since the service of Christ includes all true developments of body, soul, and spirit, so every wholesome and truly human activity is a real preparation for Holy Orders. Excellence in athletics, in art, in science, in scholarship, in history, above all, a knowledge of man's thought and nature,

contribute to the excellence of the minister which they enrich. It was a remark of the Bishop of Lincoln, at a Church congress that, by the right sort of undergraduate for a candidate for Ordination, he did not mean one who was already more than half a clergyman; I am sure he would have been ready to add that he did not mean one who was still only half a Christian.

Perhaps the change which must be expected in ordained life may best be expressed as consisting in an increased freedom for the service of God and man. The black coat and the white surplice are not meant to separate a clergyman from his brethren, they may rather be looked on as representing the sorrow of which our common life is full, and the joy of which it is capable. If the priest stands vested at the altar, it is because every one of those whose spokesman and servant he is, must come there in the marriage garment. If he is free from many of the obligations of social and civil life, it is that he may give himself more freely to the things of the unseen, according to the pregnant command, *ἐν ταῖς ἱερουργίαις*.

Two simple facts mark one side of this life of liberty. A priest may, at any moment, by day or night, be called by the needs of the dying to celebrate, and therefore to receive the Holy Communion. What has been, in any true life, its highest point, varying perhaps in frequency since Confirmation in view of the varying circumstances through which the hand of Wisdom has moulded character—sometimes, it may be, only possible amidst the helps of home, or sometimes again, in other lives, the privilege of fellowship in the University; certainly for all, the time of exceptional retirement, and sacred repose, and of thoughts that refuse to accept expression—constant readiness for this tremendous act is the distinguishing mark of the ordained man; it is by this standard that his life's conversation must be tested. And again, the daily service, morning and evening, is enjoined upon all priests and deacons, not being let by sickness or other urgent cause, to be said privately or openly.

These are the two foundations of the clerical life—readiness for the Eucharist, constancy in the utterance of the prepared words—Lord's Prayer, Creed, Psalms, and Collects—into

which new meaning grows through the priest's whole life. If this provision of the Church should seem to any one to have in it danger of formalism, our reply must be that it is the strongest call to guarding against formalism, by that recollection of spirit, without which all forms are vain. Recollection implies forethought, and few better pieces of advice have been given to candidates for Holy Orders, than his who said that as their Ordination drew near, they would do well to prepare for the Daily Service as they had been used to prepare for Communion, and for Communion with fresh diligence and prayer.

On the foundation of a life thus lifted up towards heaven, the true service of man will be based. And that service will be of two kinds: the work of the shepherd and the work of the fisherman, the pastoral and the missionary life. In the history of the Church the missionary life comes first. The net is cast into many waters, and the first aim is to gather as many as can be reached, and bring them to the test, "What think ye of Christ?" "Follow Me." It is this test which, by the presentation of Christ to man's will, shows who is, and who is not, of God. After the sifting by this Divine mode of judgment, some are found worthy of admission into the Church, and they form the flock. For us in England, our work is first for these—to feed, to guide, to protect the sheep of Christ—while there are still multitudes outside, and multitudes nominally and potentially included in the flock, but actually needing missionary work.

Having thus tried to trace the prospect of ordained life, as being representative of, not alien from, the life of all Christians, as lifted by definite prayer and ever-present readiness for Communion, as having for its scope the presentation of Christ to all, and the special training of the members of His Body, I may venture to go somewhat more closely into the character of the work thus sketched out. Of missionary work in England I will not say much, for though it may often be most attractive, it is rather exceptional than usual in the life of the newly ordained. The vocation to missionary work among the heathen must be tested as the vocation to Holy Orders has already been tested. If a man is free, fit, and happy in the prospect, the need of men and

the sense of a Divine call will fill up the rest. But it is the Pastoral Life to which we are first and specially called. That does not merely mean a life of preaching, large as is the place which sermons must hold in the work of the ministry. Ordinary preaching—of a pastoral character, as distinguished from missionary preaching—should mean the explanation and application of the Bible to the life of the faithful, and, like the Bible, it requires and presupposes the Creeds, the good deposit or mould of the faith. No pastor does his duty to his people who merely explains to them the duties or truths included in particular texts, unless he has first set before them, as in preparation for Baptism, Confirmation, or Communion, the scheme of the Christian faith in its true coherence and completeness. Every book of the New Testament assumes such previous instruction in its readers; still more does the elucidation of the Old Testament, as setting Christ before us, require such a key.

It is, therefore, an indispensable part of a man's preparation for Holy Orders, that he should get clearly in his mind, at least, an outlined view of what the Christian faith is, and on what grounds it rests; in other words, he must be able to teach it and to maintain it.

At least he must be able to teach it. He must have—what perhaps few men gain at school, but which is, nevertheless, no more than the rightful inheritance of every one of the baptized—a clear view of what the Creed means. The Catechism, starting as it does from the individual life of the child who says it, passes lightly over the Creed, and lays its emphasis (the instruction on the Sacraments being an addition to its original form) on the obedience which is the chief virtue of childhood. How many educated men could readily define, I do not say accurately, but even intelligibly, what they mean by "God," or "the Incarnation," or "the Church," or "the Communion of Saints"? These are not recondite points of theology; they belong to the foundations of the faith, and bear closely upon conduct. It is not a work of unusual difficulty to acquire a knowledge of them; little more is needed than a fixed desire, springing out of a sense of their value, aided by a simply arranged notebook which can glean what is needed under different heads from various sources.

Books are a help, but what is even more needed is that a man shall think out and assimilate for himself the sequence of the faith.

The teaching of the faith is of the first importance, but the grounds on which it rests come next.

If the connection of *credenda* has been so grasped as to bring out the fact that the Incarnation of our Lord is the foundation of the whole, throwing light backwards over the doctrine of God, and forwards over those of the Holy Spirit, the Church, the Bible, and the Sacraments, apologetics will be safely condensed, for the one thing needful will be found to be that faith in Christ which is undoubtedly bestowed, as a direct gift from God, on thousands who could not understand the intellectual arguments for its contents, and must underlie and clench such arguments, even in the case of those who most keenly feel that they desire an evidential apparatus to support their faith.

Faith must be sought and received as a gift; but no teacher of the truth, for want of labour, or in the confidence of his own conviction, should fail to collect in a form that suits his own reading and habits of thought some part of the abundant evidence for the central fact of our religion.

To teach a confirmation class what is meant by being a Christian and a Churchman is to enter upon a work which may be developed into a comprehensive and solid apology. No such advantage can be enjoyed by the preacher in his strictly pastoral and parochial work, as the secure knowledge that to himself and his audience the great Christian truths are fairly known.

When this is gained the student of Holy Scripture will possess the key to every part of it, and a unity will be given to his preaching, for his one object will be to find and set forth Christ in the Old as well as the New Testament. The future preacher must indeed learn how to use and to preserve his voice—a matter strangely neglected amongst us,—he will gain much from poetry, biography, fiction, from anything that increases his knowledge of human nature; but no technical or special preparation will prove a substitute for such a relation to the Bible as shall secure a general knowledge of its connection, and lay out the ground for building up a complete scriptural system.

Here, as in the work of assimilating the faith, it is worth while to note the value of individual and special work. Commentaries only begin to be really useful when the text has been studied, and to some extent analyzed, by the student himself. The references we make for ourselves by comparing Scripture with Scripture are of much greater value than any which are provided for us by books. It is no dishonour to the sacred duty of obtaining some critical knowledge of the Canonical Books to say that, for purposes of edification, familiarity with the body of Scripture, as it passes to us from the authority of Christ who used it, and of His Church led to recognize it, is of more practical importance than a knowledge, and especially a very incipient and partial knowledge, of its history and literary formation.

If I thus lay stress on the advantage of a familiarity with the Bible which is within the power of any one who will give time and pains to it, I ought to add that a knowledge of the Prayer-book, as it is, has a value apart from the knowledge of its history. To understand its directions we must indeed know something of their origin; but an accurate acquaintance with what is actually prescribed by our present rubrics is not so universal as it should be. Before a man is ordained, he should have read the 'Canons of the Reformed Church of England, and he will do well to add such a knowledge of ecclesiastical law as will save him from making mistakes as to the laws of marriage and burial, or the right relation of the priest to his bishop, his parish officers, and his people.

Along with a fundamental scheme for teaching the faith and for studying the Bible, one of the most useful of weapons for the priest, and one which may well be prepared beforehand in view of Ordination, is a clear plan for dealing spiritually with individual souls. Such a plan is given us in the order for the Visitation of the Sick, from which may be extracted a series of principles, which, *mutatis mutandis*, are applicable to any soul with whom a priest may have to deal. Thus, the aim of the whole service is found in its opening word, *Peace*. The first thoughts into which we are to approach this aim are indicated in the opening prayers, and they are the reality of sin, of redemption through the Blood of Christ, and of the personal Tempter. Next follows

an exhortation which points out that all the Divine acts towards us are designed to make the bad good, or the good better, in virtue of a mystical relation to Christ, of which Baptism was the beginning. A review, therefore, must be made of the present position of the baptized person, and he must examine himself under the five heads of Faith, Repentance, Charity, Right use of Possessions, and the possible need of special Confession.

If these heads are carefully developed they will be found to afford guidance in nearly every pastoral duty as to individual members of the flock.

I have touched upon vocation, the prospect of the ministry, the need of plans for teaching, for using the Bible, for individual dealing, it remains only to speak of the special aspect of preparation which is needed in view of the continual work and frequent distraction which clerical duties entail.

It has been said that probably, during the ministry of our Lord, His Life was the most open life ever lived on earth. Though He seldom sought crowds, He seems to have been approachable by all men at all times. With Him and His there was sometimes "no leisure not so much as to eat." Yet His acts were never hurried, never discomposed, always sweet, mild, dignified, and consistent. If we would imitate Him we must develope and value that inner side of life which was the source of all that met the eyes of men. If the day seems full at Oxford, it will be fuller still when the needs of a population beyond our grasp press upon us like the multitudes in the wilderness. It is only common prudence to begin to form in comparative quietness the habits which will be most useful in the time of pressure. Foremost among these are the duties of meditation and intercession, underlying as they do the two great duties of the love of God and the love of man.

Meditation is, doubtless, often practised by those who are not accustomed to call it by that name, for it is simply the meeting-point of prayer and Bible-reading, the attempt to receive the message of Scripture as coming directly from God, and bearing on the individual life. A perfect description of what a meditation may be will be found in a little essay of which Dr. Liddon was the author, called "The

Priest in his Inner Life." It must be remembered that it was written for men close upon their Ordination, and even for them it may be questioned whether Dr. Liddon in his later years would have insisted as strongly as he does on *daily* meditation.

If a meditation is to be what he describes, it needs that not less than twenty minutes should be kept free for it, and if a beginner would devote thirty minutes regularly once a week to the practice, he would have made a real beginning. Dr. Liddon points out that the essence of meditation is the employment of three faculties of the soul, the memory, the understanding, and the will. In other words, we must ask ourselves, "What do I know already as to the scene, or mystery, or utterance which I have chosen to meditate on?" "What can I find out about it when I bring it into the presence of our Lord?" "What shall I do because of it?" or in three pregnant words—Remember, Consider, Resolve.

It is a reason for commending this practice to men looking forward to Ordination, and indeed to all who are in earnest, during Oxford life, that it is a secret practice. Many things which men feel to be good for them are difficult because they seem to involve something which may be mistaken for display. Meditation requires nothing of the kind. It is a matter entirely between the soul and God.

It is, indeed, possible that to some minds there may seem to be a danger of religious selfishness in meditation. If so, it will be corrected by the simultaneous growth of systematic intercession. The great Psalm of the Incarnation represents the Father as calling out the intercession of the Christ for His work of inheriting the nations, "Desire of Me." And He hands it on to us, "Ask, and it shall be given you."

To pray—if but in a single sentence—each morning, for "all whom I may meet to-day," and each evening, "for all with whom I have had to do," introduces a principle of power into a life; to touch with prayer our varied relations with others is to bring those relations into submission to the Divine Will, and to offer ourselves for work, the opportunity for which will certainly follow, as the thief's petition came before our Lord as soon as He had prayed for all.

I find I have been led to sacred ground, but perhaps it is not possible to touch this subject and remain merely in what is familiar, and which does not touch our deepest thoughts, for he was not mistaken who summed up his meditation on the Ministry with the words—

“ Quid es tu? Nihil et omnia, O sacerdos.”

THE END.

NOTES

ON THE

BOOK OF JOB.



MORE than twenty years ago the Bishop of Lincoln gave, to some clergy in retreat at Cuddesdon, an analysis of the Book of Job considered as a drama of temptation. The Bishop must not be held responsible for the accuracy of my recollection, but I think the following heads are those which he gave us.

1. *The tempted man—*

- (1) a good man, 'none like him in the earth' (i. 8);
- (2) not a young man;
- (3) a man of prayer, with religious care for those belonging to him (i. 5).

2. *The tempter—*

- (1) a spirit created holy with great gifts (cf. St. Luke x. 18; St. Jude 6);
- (2) stronger than man;
- (3) yet a creature of God, exercising a derived and limited power (cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 & 1 Chron. xxi. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 7; St. John xix. 11; 1 Cor. x. 13).

3. *The instruments of temptation, animate and inanimate—*

- (1) open enemies (i. 15-17);
- (2) mistaken friends (ii. 9-11);
- (3) powers of nature (i. 16-19);
- (4) disease (ii. 7).

4. *The agony of the tempted soul.*

Job and his friends are agreed in thinking that misfortune is always Divine vengeance on conscious sin. But Job is not conscious of sin, and will not acknowledge that he is being chastised for sin. His friends believe him to be hypocritically concealing his sin, and press him to acknowledge it. This he refuses to do, though he cannot interpret God's dealings with him. This inability is his worst suffering.

5. *The purpose of temptation—*

(1) on the part of Satan,—to induce Job to renounce God;

(2) on the part of Almighty God,—to give Job deeper knowledge of himself and of God.

This revelation comes first through the interposition of Elihu (xxxii. 2; xxxiii. 12). He explains that in view of the infinite greatness of God, Job must acknowledge that he may be suffering for causes other than those he is conscious of (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 4; Ps. xix. 12; St. John ix. 3; 1 St. John i. 10 and iii. 20).

The words of Elihu are followed by those of the Almighty Himself teaching Job His greatness as the Creator.

6. *The result of temptation—*

(1) increased knowledge of God, and

(2) penitence (xlii. 5, 6);

(3) a greater power of intercession (xlii. 8);

(4) realization of the communion of saints (xlii. 12-14; cf. i. 2, 3);

(5) mystical conformity to Christ in His risen life (xlii. 9-12).

The following attempt to analyse the dialogue which takes up the greater part of the Book of Job may serve to illustrate the fourth of the foregoing heads.

If the critical opinion is correct, which looks upon the Book of Job as the combination of two documents written at different times, the inspired formation of the sacred canon may be looked for in the combination no less than in the original construction of the text.

CH. III. JOB.

Would that I had not lived.

A weariness of life on account of the greatness of sorrow produces a longing for death, or rather for a reversal of the past, and non-existence, which takes the form of a curse against the day of birth.

It is an aggravation of the sorrow, that the distress has not been drawn down by pride, but was preceded by a restless presentiment, which has been only too sadly fulfilled.

CH. IV, V. ELIPHAZ.

Thou sufferest : thou hast sinned.

He implies that although Job has done good to others, his own life has not been right with God. 'Who ever perished, being innocent, or where were the righteous cut off?' Then he relates a vision which taught him the absolute and imperial justice of Almighty God. He exalts the greatness and power of God, and he adds what might, but for his previous attack upon Job, have been a comfort to him. 'Happy is the man whom God correcteth, &c.'

CH. VI, VII. JOB.

I suffer—let me die.

Grief has come to him as bitter food, and hence his utter sorrow is more than justified. Death is his one comfort, the one thing he longs for. From his friends he only asked sympathy, and that has been denied him, as the

water is denied to the travellers in the dry Arabian desert. He again challenges them to see if he is a hypocrite, and rebukes their hardness towards him. Again he cries out for death, and reminds God of his insignificance. In verses 20 and 21 there is an apparent anticipation of the conviction of sin which follows later, but this seems to be only hypothetical. 'Let it be that I *have* sinned.' But even so it is the first break in the clouds. Job is suffering from a double mistake. He cannot see that there may be sin apart from hypocrisy, and he cannot see why God should put him through such a punishment as he is bearing. This passage points to an enlightenment on the former, but not yet on the latter mistake.

CH. VIII. BILDAD.

Be pure: God will help thee.

'Why accuse God? Be perfect and He will help thee.'

It appears as if here the true solution was seen in a measure by Bildad. Perfection is what Job needs, but it must be obtained through a deeper repentance and submission.

CH. IX, X. JOB.

Good or bad, I perish, for want of a mediator.

'Perfect? that is hopeless, because of the greatness of God.'

Job's consciousness in his righteousness seems to waver. 'Let it be I am not righteous after all, for that is what it comes to. What matters that? If I am righteous I cannot get beyond blind submission. Perfection is no security for my soul. If He is the Supreme, I am nothing. There is no common lord to Him and to me. Show me wherefore Thou contendest with me. Good Thou art, my breath and my preserver; why then lay this trouble upon me? At least let me have a respite before my death, if I may not die at once.'

Job's wavering comes out in this speech. In ix. 20 he seems inclined not to justify himself, but in x. 7 he says again, 'Thou knowest that I am not wicked.'

CH. XI. ZOPHAR.

It is vain to strive with God: confess thy sin.

He still assumes that Job is consciously lying. 'It is hopeless to think that He doth not know; the secrets of His wisdom correspond with all existing facts. Equally hopeless is it to think that He will not attend, for consideration is with Him as sight. Put away iniquity and all will be well.'

CH. XII, XIII, XIV. JOB.

Whatever comes, I will be true with God.

(a) (xii, xiii. 20). 'Yes indeed God is great, nature herself declares it. But that is no reason for flattering Him with lies as you do, and wish me to do. Nothing would be gained by saying I have done what I have not done. Rather I shall reason with Him. You may consider this rash, but though He slay me yet will I wait for Him and I will maintain my own ways before Him.'

O Lord, how long?

(b) (xiii. 20-xiv). Abruptly he turns to God with a double request—

(1) for relief from fear;

(2) for intercourse.

He implies that there is an account to be made between himself and God, which he has not the means of clearing up. Then he turns to himself, and speaking of himself in the third person he points to his utter wretchedness, and goes on to the miseries of man's life on earth, and its contemptible littleness. May he not pass away into the grave, and wait there in peace for the time which must surely come, when the love of God will succeed to this inexplicable wrath, and the longed for intercourse may be granted? Alas, his sin seems sealed up, it cannot be grasped or dealt with, and meanwhile the earth and all that is in it passes away.

CH. XV. ELIPHAZ.

Who maketh thee to differ? Thy need is the need of all.

‘Thy desire to reason is pure folly. Thy refusal of blind submission is a refusal of prayer. Who art thou that the traditional view (viz., that religion is a system of temporal rewards and punishments,) should not console thee? *Is there no secret thing with thee?* Listen to me, guilt brings its own punishment.’

CH. XVI, XVII. JOB.

God is against me, yet He only is for me.

Disheartened by the obstinate misconception of Eliphaz, and thus driven from the contemplative hope which his last speech had touched, this speech shows Job in his most bitter mood. ‘Miserable comforters are ye all.’ Hence come his most hardy words, as it seems, of God. ‘He teareth me in His wrath, who hateth me,’ and lastly, with this, his boldest words as to his own innocence, ‘Not for any injustice in my hands, also my prayer is pure.’ Yet no sooner has he said this than he declares that his witness is in heaven, and then follows a remarkable passage, recalling that about the Daysman. ‘O that one might plead for a man with God—lay down now, put me in a surety with Thee.’ He ends, as usual, with a lament over the miseries of this life, including the pregnant words, ‘My purposes are broken off.’

CH. XVIII. BILDAD.

Rage will not help thee: again I say, Confess.

This speech is mostly a repetition of the judgments on the wicked, but there is a short preface, accusing Job indirectly of impotent rage and pride in thinking his case so unique, and condemning the conventional wisdom of his friends.

CH. XIX. JOB.

Still trusting God in the depth of woe, I warn
you that you are rash.

A most pathetic lament ending with a cry for pity, introduces the great declaration of Job's faith in the ἀγχίστευσ, and after this he warns his friends of the danger which they incur from their persisting in imputing to him the 'root of the matter,' i.e. deceit.

CH. XX. ZOPHAR.

Sin cannot prosper.

Like Bildad's last speech, this is merely an indirect rebuke of the feeling which Job has of the unique character of his sufferings,—a reiteration of the denunciation of temporal punishments on the wicked, connected by a short introduction with Job's speech.

CH. XXI. JOB.

It often prospers till death.

'It is not true that the wicked are always cut off, or punished in this life. Sometimes this is the case, but not always, nor would your theory be satisfied by judgments upon the children of the wicked. The wicked have their punishment after death.'

CH. XXII. ELIPHAZ.

Thy sin is without question: confess.

He first ridicules Job's desire for an argument with God, and then, more plainly than before, declares Job's wilful iniquity, accusing him of selfish cruelty. Next, he accuses Job of an epicurean disbelief in the care of God for man, and reminds him that this has brought down Divine judgments on many already. Let Job return from his sin, and he shall prosper and have power to intercede for others.

CH. XXIII, XXIV. JOB.

O that God would reveal His ways.

Another great cry for an opportunity of pleading before God. It is to be noted that Job has no doubt whatever that if God would only give him, as it were, an audience, he would find mercy with Him. 'Would He plead against me with His great power? No, but he would put strength in me.' And this speech contains the remarkable words, 'When He hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold.' *What Job appears to miss is the truth that the trial which he desired was being worked out in the very sufferings of which he complained.* Then there is another assertion of innocence, followed by a complaint that God allows sorrow but not death to come upon him, and that he does not show to the righteous His judgments on the wicked, whose successful iniquities are again related.

CH. XXV. BILDAD.

God is great.

In a short speech he speaks again of the supreme and unapproachable holiness of God, a true major premise, but as uttered by him suggesting an untrue minor premise.

CH. XXVI-XXXI.

I wait for the Infinite Creator.

The description given by Bildad of the greatness of God is insufficient. Job proceeds to add to it and sums up, 'Lo, these are *part* of His ways, but how little a portion is heard of Him, but the thunder of His power who can understand?'

Zophar does not take his turn in the discussion, and Job proceeds—

(a) He strongly repeats he will hold fast his righteousness;

(β) He testifies to the judgments which come upon the wicked, and we must reconcile this with his words in chapter xxi. What appears on the whole is that, while he denies that prosperity and adversity mark off the righteous and the wicked at any given time, and while he longs for such a manifest judgment upon the wicked as would bring God's moral government before the eyes of men, yet he holds to the truth that the wicked are all through their prosperity troubled by an evil conscience—'if a man know him he is in the terrors of the shadow of death'—and that their prosperity will not be lasting.

(γ) From this reference to judgment on the wicked he passes on to the great description of Wisdom.

(δ) Job recounts his former virtues;

(ε) his present afflictions;

(ζ) the absence of sin in his former life—and he ends by another challenge, as it were, to God to hear and answer him.

CH. XXXII-XXXVII. ELIHU.

God is greater than Man.

After an apologetic preface, Elihu rebukes Job for asserting his perfect innocence, and for saying that God took him for an enemy. There are three ways in which God deals with man,—by visions, by chastisement, and by a mediator. Job is presumptuous in accusing God of withholding judgment. The Divine purposes are mysterious, but righteous. Man, higher than the beasts, is taught by suffering. He must not 'desire the night,' for he needs to live to be taught by God.

The lesson of the greatness of God is enforced by a description of His works in nature.

After this speech of Elihu, the argument is taken up by the Lord Himself; and by the two divisions of the Divine description of the wonders of Creation, Job is led first to silence, and then to contrition.

The Central Place of the
Incarnation

AND

Tests of New Teaching.



TWO SERMONS,

PREACHED IN TAUNTON IN THE
YEAR 1896,

BY

V. S. S. COLES, M.A.,

*Assistant-Curate of Shepton Beauchamp and Chaplain of
the Pusey House, at Oxford.*

PRICE THREEPENCE.

TAUNTON :

ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH SHOP.

On both the occasions of the following Sermons, I ventured to make large extracts from the Lecture on Bishop Andrewes by Dean Church, which was first published in a collection of lectures by various authors, called *Masters in English Theology*, and is also included in one of the lately published volumes of the Dean's works, called *Pascal, and other Essays* (Macmillan, 1895).

That lecture was once described by a learned person as the only good account of the English Reformation; certainly it is well worth the consideration of anyone who wishes to gain a right view of it.

I have been led to print the sermons by the criticism on the second contained in a sermon preached at the Roman Catholic Church of St. George, and reported in the *Somerset County Gazette*, of December 12th, 1896.

It will be seen that my subject was not the continuity of the Reformed Church of England, but rather the truth of her teaching. I was indeed led to mention continuity, but only in a subordinate place.

It seems to me that it is not always remembered by defenders of the Church of England, that truth is a greater thing than continuity. They are at great pains to show that our national Christianity was not chiefly derived from Rome, and that the Bishop of Rome has no Patriarchal or quasi-Patriarchal rights over the Church of England. But surely this is a point of secondary importance. It is not about rights conferred by the Church, and liable to be taken away by the Church, that we are at issue with the Pope. It is about his claim to rights conferred by our Lord Himself, and therefore inalienable. Such rights we believe to have been bestowed upon the Bishops as successors of the Apostles, but not upon one Bishop, as the successor of one Apostle. We find ample witness to the Episcopal claim from the beginning, and in the Eastern Church as well as in the Western. We find no facts which can be taken as clear witness to the Papal

claim in the first three centuries of Christianity, and we find much in those ages which conflicts with it.

If the Papal claim were really based on the institution of our Lord, it would be our duty to submit to it, even if there were no more possibility of representing the succession of the Church of England as derived from Rome than there is in the case of the Church of Jerusalem.

If the Papal claims have no Divine basis, then they ought not to be accepted by those who are convinced of their baselessness, and who find it their duty to state their convictions, even in Rome itself. There are many considerations which enable us to see that it would be as unwise, as it would probably be futile, to proselytise in countries where the Papal authority is traditional and unshaken, but nevertheless, truth is one, and in the last resort, what is true in London is true in Rome.

The complaint made of my Sermon before the English Church Union is that I represent the English Reformed Church as having been blessed by a restoration of doctrines which she had discarded. It will be seen by those who are so good as to read the sermon (as distinct from the report which was all my critic had seen) that I was far from saying that the doctrine of the Real Presence and of Confession had been discarded by the Church of England. What I did say was that they seemed new to Englishmen when they were preached in the Oxford Revival. But those who thus preached them always maintained that these doctrines had been taught continuously in the Prayer Book, though they had been greatly neglected and forgotten. To deal with such neglect is the function of prophets, and prophets our Lord leads us to expect in Christian times. He expressly bids us judge these prophets by their fruits, and the object of my words was to discuss what this means, and how it applies to our own day. Whatever the meaning may be thought to be, the language does not lead us to the picture of a ready and accessible infallibility, by which we are to be saved the pains and responsibility of personal investigation.

Our duty to what seems new teaching is to see whether it is really old, not whether it is accepted or rejected by the present Pope.

The right process may be less easy than that which has been substituted for it, but facility is not the chief thing we have to seek in our efforts to know the will of God.

Meanwhile, if we have to wait for the full determination of many great, but secondary, matters, we can rest on that doctrine of the Incarnation, which is specially brought home to the heart of each Christian by the power of the Holy Ghost. All Sacraments, all Church ordinances, all means of grace and securities of truth, whether they are of direct Divine institution, or the outcome of the effects of holy men, sanctioned by the Church, lead up to Christ, and it is the Holy Ghost, who, by and through all such means, and in spite of our perverse and imperfect use of them, is the one Leader.

It did not lie in my way to speak of this in the English Church Union Sermon, and I am therefore glad to print along with it another sermon, which I preached earlier in the year, when, as Chaplain to the High Sheriff, it was my duty to address a very different congregation from that which occupied a few seats in the Church of the Holy Trinity at our English Church Union Festival. The contrast suggests a thought which it is perhaps well to note. One who teaches in the name of the Church of England, and is convinced that God has spoken to her, by the Catholic Revival, has two duties before him.

First, he has to preach Christ, as the One Foundation, the direct and personal Lord and Life of men. This duty includes the preaching of the Holy Spirit, Who is now doing invisibly throughout the world what our Lord did visibly, in one small part of it.

The second duty is, to preach those means, the Church, the Scriptures, the Ministry, the Sacraments, which are ordinarily used by the Holy Spirit, as His instruments, and which are necessary and indispensable

for those persons, and in those places, where their use is known by God to be possible.

As to whether a particular person is included within these limits, the judge is not man but God. And since we are certain that God sees fit sometimes to dispense with even His own appointed means, but never with the necessity of a right relation to Himself in His three-fold Personality, the duty of preaching Christ, revealing the Father, and giving the Holy Spirit, comes first, and the duty of preaching the Church and the Sacraments comes second.

This distinction will seem impossible to those who sacrifice all to the presentment of a united front ; it will bring comfort and strength to those who desire to exercise faith in loyalty to facts, and to hold the middle path, which is not the path of cowardice, but of courage and of truth.



The Central Place of the Incarnation.

S. Matt. xi., 27.

“ALL THINGS ARE DELIVERED UNTO ME OF MY FATHER:
AND NO MAN KNOWETH THE SON, BUT THE FATHER:
NEITHER KNOWETH ANY MAN THE FATHER, SAYE THE
SON, AND HE TO WHOMSOEVER THE SON WILL REVEAL
HIM.”

*Preached in the Church of St. Mary Magdalene, Taunton,
on Sunday, January 19th, 1896, before Her Majesty's
Commissioner of Assize.*

The ancient custom, observed to-day, whereby the solemn administration of justice is preceded by the solemn worship of God, reminds us of the debt which the Church owes to all her children. The national life is of God, no less than the Church life, but while the one deals with the things that are seen, the other is concerned with the things that are unseen; and, if those who are engaged in the great and painful work of justice come to this holy place for aid and blessing, this act of theirs lays upon the whole body of their brethren the responsibility of seeing that the Grace of God may not be hindered by the faults of His people. In view of such a responsibility as this, there comes the recollection of some difficulties which are found to disturb the repose and hinder the refreshment which the Church should offer to her children.

Shall we not be right if we say that to many who seek her aid, the Church appears to be too confident and too divided?

She appears to be too confident. The greatness of the power which sustains all things, the force and intelligence which give certainty and harmony to natural law, the inscrutable excellence before which our efforts and conceptions are found helpless, and in their very helplessness find rest—these are not thoughts alien to the minds of men. But the clear light and true knowledge which the Church claims, the familiarity of children with a Personal Father, the definite utterance of verbal prayer, the realization of Providence, the confession of Three Persons in One God—these things, so inherent in our Creed and worship, make a demand on faith, which honest and true hearts are sometimes constrained to meet with a wondering and impatient protest against such confident assertion, where at best probability seems possible, such sense of possession and initiation, where the great and gifted have felt that they were but “infants crying for the light.”

Not only is the confidence of faith, cherished by the Church as her best treasure, a difficulty to some of her children, but still more difficult are those divisions, which she unceasingly deplures. There is no need to recount them. However true it may be to say that they are partly caused by honesty and life, it remains certain that they divert energy from its rightful channels, obscure the majesty of truth, and hinder the fulfilment of the Divine purposes.

With these two difficulties in view, I turn to the great words offered us by this morning's Lesson, which seem to deal directly with the first of them, and unless I am mistaken, go far to mitigate the second.

Our Lord declares not only that He stands in a relation of mutual knowledge with the Father, but that the knowledge of the Father is a gift which can only be obtained through Him. “No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.” The knowledge of the Father here spoken of is

evidently something wholly different from such knowledge of God as the pagan world had attained to; it is something more than the approximate knowledge of God which St. Paul tells the Romans was revealed to all mankind through creation and conscience; it is more than had been fully grasped by the Saints of the Old Covenant, to whom the promise, "He shall call Me, Thou art My Father," was one great mark of the Messiah to come; it was just that direct, personal, loving, confident relation of the soul to God from which the weakness and the sincerity of man's heart alike tend to shrink, but which is claimed to-day, as from the beginning, by the Church of Christ.

This it is which is to be the result of a right relation to the Son. It is with His claims that we have first to reckon. It is from the consideration of the man Christ Jesus, as He appears in history, as He stands in relation to the needs of the soul to-day, that we cannot excuse ourselves for escaping. Who but He has given man a hope of the fulfilment of his best longings, and of deliverance from his worst fears? Who else has compelled us either to acknowledge Him as Divine, or else to attribute moral teaching, which has struck the conscience of the world, to craft, or self-deception, or the wanderings of an unbalanced mind? These are some of the questions which demand an answer from those who are willing to look at facts, even while the Personality of God remains yet dim and unfamiliar. It is on the character of Jesus Christ, and the known results of His work, that we are bound to rely to encourage one another in the spiritual effort which leads to faith. If it is at least probable that Jesus is God—if our own enquiries have brought us so far—then surely it is reasonable to ask Him Who made us, however faintly we know Him as yet, to reveal to us, as He revealed of old to Simon Peter, the knowledge of Christ, to enable us to say, by the power of the Holy Ghost, that Jesus is the Lord. And, when once this is given us, the difficulty of knowing God is at an end. We experience that blessing which St. Paul tells us was the result even to the bodiless angels, of the Incarnation, that

we know the mystery of the Divine Nature. We have feared to bring down the supreme glory to be expressed in images drawn from the life of man, and lo, now, in man we find God Himself. The rest of the heart upon the infinite, which may calm and nerve even those who are waiting for the knowledge of their Father, is now united with the closeness and sweetness of human intercourse. Jesus is all that we are, but He is more than we are. At the moment when His Human Soul was created, and His Human Body taken from Mary, both soul and body were appropriated by the Person of the Eternal Son, and the words and acts of the Son of Mary, though they bear the marks of human weakness and human growth, are, for believing Christians, the interpretation of the character of God. He says, as the result of having become a worm and no man, the very scorn of men, and the outcast of the people, "I will declare Thy Name unto My brethren"; "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." The definition of the Personality of God is no longer a matter of difficult speculation; no longer does the fear haunt us that we are constructing a creation of our own imagination; for God is made known to us as He from Whom Jesus came, to Whom Jesus is gone, with Whom Jesus is One.

But it may be said we have only shifted the difficulty, and substituted the question of belief in the Virgin-born for the question of belief in the Personal Creator. But surely, though a moral effort, and a rational surrender of the spirit are still needed, the change of position is a gain in the interests of faith. The claims of our Lord are supported on the one hand by historical evidence; by the unique history of the Jews; by the correspondence between the predictions of their future as turning on their faithfulness to God, Who promised them the Messiah, and the actual circumstances which have followed upon their rejection of Him, and by the evidence for His Resurrection, amply convincing as it is to those who see reason to expect exceptional results from an exceptional cause, or rather from the culminating act of God's dealings with His creatures. And, on the other

hand, the gift of faith, enabling men to pass from the sense of probability, which is a sufficient ground of action for the reason, to the conviction which satisfies the heart, is found in all classes and races, round about the Name and the Person of Jesus Christ. Surely, a presentment so far-reaching and yet so simple, using and honouring all known facts, and yet resting on a mysterious and inscrutable gift to the soul, is in truth, and by our experience, the help that our Lord declares it to be, when He says, "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him."

But it is not only the confidence of the Church which needs to be justified. Her divisions must also be faced. The differences of opinion in the Church of England are doubtless in striking contrast to the agreement of Roman Catholics on one side of her, and on the other to the multitude of sects, each resting on its own peculiar tenets; and the contrast seems at first to be altogether to her disadvantage. But is it not really the case that the apparent inconsistency is the result of a steadfast determination to refuse either to sacrifice unity to truth, or truth to unity? If Scripture, history, reason, forbid us to give way to the attractive claim of a world-wide society, and if the great prayer of Christ for unity fills us with shame when anything short of loyalty to truth separates us from our brethren, then it is at least worth while to ask whether a solid ground of confidence can be discerned in the reformed yet conservative position of the Anglican Episcopate. We have inherited a tradition which claims to be true to facts, and at the same time to go as far as possible in maintaining unity. But such a tradition can have no strength if it is merely a theory; it must have, if it is to be powerful, some deep and warm appeal to the heart, something which shall be for us what his own interpretation of the sacred text is to the Bible Christian, what the decisions of the Pope are to the Roman Catholic. Let me borrow some noble words in which Dean Church has described the way in which, after the throes of the Reformation, the second generation of the reformed Anglican divines, Hooker and

Andrewes, found their way to the true basis of their position.

"The English Church," he says, "had taken up its ground on the Scriptures and the Primitive Church. Positive ground was needed on which to rest the claim that England was better and more primitive than Rome. Such a ground it was not easy to find in that narrow Calvinism which the Puritans were trying to force upon the Government in the reign of Elizabeth. Something was wanted, as fervent, but more true, more noble, more Catholic than their devotion and self-discipline. The higher spirits of the time wanted to breathe more freely, and in a purer air. They found what they wanted in the language, the ideas, the tone and temper of the best Christian literature. That turned their thoughts from words to a Person. It raised them from the disputes of local cliques to the ideas which have made the Universal Church. It recalled them from arguments that revolved round a certain number of traditional formulæ . . . to a truer and worthier idea both of man and God, to the overwhelming revelation of the Word Incarnate, and the result of it on the moral standard and behaviour of real and living men. It led them from a theology which ended in cross-grained and perverse conscientiousness to a theology which ended in adoration, self-surrender, and blessing, and in the awe and joy of welcoming the Presence of the Eternal Beauty, the Eternal Sanctity, and the Eternal Love, the Sacrifice, and Reconciliation of the World."

I can scarcely apologise for borrowing this beautiful passage, because I venture to think that these words lead us to a strong and legitimate ground of confidence, which we sometimes forget to claim.

We have our disputes about the Bible. Let us remember that each of its books when first written was placed in the hands of those who were already believers in the promise or the advent of Jesus Christ. Let us remember that He has summed up His teaching about the Scriptures in those pregnant words, "They are they that testify of Me." Whatever else inspiration may

mean, it means first and chiefly that guidance of the sacred writers which makes their utterances serve, in varied ways, to the exhibition of the Love of God in the gift to us of His Son.

We have our disputes about the Church and the Sacraments. If these cannot at once be healed, their bitterness will be greatly lessened if we remember that no serious teacher has ever put the Church and the Sacraments in any other position than that as means to a right relation to Jesus Christ. Let it be clearly understood that Infant Baptism does but give to the child an inheritance which, whether in this world or the next, must be claimed by the willing surrender of the heart to Christ, that the highest conception of the Eucharist does but bring to an appointed issue those energies of worship and acceptance which the Holy Spirit is always working in Christ's members, that the strong words of absolution are but the sentence upon a penitence, already kindled by the thought of Christ.

If I am not wholly mistaken, the last fifteen years have seen a great advance in the ability of those who believe in Christ to understand each other, and to him who comes to-day for strength and inspiration to our worship, we are at least found united in saying, "I believe in Christ, God and Man, in two natures, one Divine Person, and I believe all that He has taught me, by His word and by His Church." It is in earthen vessels that He offers you His treasures, it is through media all unworthy that His light shall reach you. If it is His promise that your eyes shall see your teachers, and if those teachers seem to fail you, yet their teaching is but the moral discipline to prepare you for a better promise, the promise of the voice behind you, the voice of an inspired conscience, saying, "This is the way, walk ye in it, when ye would turn to the right hand, and when ye would turn to the left." Nay, that voice within you is not all. At the end of the great statement that by Him alone you can know the Father, there follows the supreme invitation that has never lost its power, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Tests of New Teaching.

St. Matt. vii., 16.

YE SHALL KNOW THEM BY THEIR FRUITS.

*Preached in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Taunton, by
the Rev. V. S. S. Coles, at the District Anniversary of
the English Church Union, December 3rd, 1896.*

These words are the rule given by our Lord Himself for the testing of what seems new in religious teaching. He is speaking of prophets—false prophets, indeed—but to discern false prophets implies the power to recognise true prophets. The test, rightly applied, will vindicate the true as well as expose the false.

We are familiar with the warning that prediction of the future, prominent as it is in the prophetic office, is not its true essence. The prophet is not first and chiefly the foreteller, but the declarer, and especially the fresh and unexpected declarer, of Divine truth. The Revelation of God has been continuous from Abraham, or rather from the promise of the woman's seed. But it has continually been checked, restored, enlarged by messages from on high which have worn the aspect of something new, and have come upon the children of God in the light of a surprise.

This is prophecy, and it is clear that, if the truth is to be disciplined by the attacks of error, nothing is easier than for those who have not been sent to pervert the prophetic office for the teaching of what is not Divine.

To discern between true and false prophecy is, then, to be able to know when to accept and when to reject teaching which appears as new, with a claim to Divine authority.

It is by a metaphor that our Lord gives us the test. Prophets are to be judged as if they were trees, by the fruit they bear, and which their hearers are to pluck and taste. This metaphor or parable suggests two ideas. First, those who are to judge the fruit must have a right taste; secondly, they must, in most cases, be content to wait till the fruit is ripe.

To know whether doctrine is good, we must have some power of determining what good doctrine is. He whose senses are in no way exercised to discern between good and evil can no more pronounce upon new teaching than a man without the sense of taste can pronounce upon a new kind of fruit. And, on the other hand, fruit cannot be tasted until it is ripe. Like the husbandman, we must commonly wait for the fruits: it is the results of doctrine, the issue and outcome of a movement, the fulfilment of prophecy, which enable us to set our seal on its Divine character. Though foretelling is not the first act of the prophet, it is by his being found to have foretold that his teaching is justified. So in the Book of Deuteronomy, the test of a true prophet, that is of a true teacher, is whether his predictions come true. The prediction, though not the essence, is one test of the prophecy. The challenge of God to the false prophets in the latter part of Isaiah is: "Declare ye the former things what they be . . . or show us things for to come. Declare the things that are to come after, that we may know that ye are gods," and the evidence offered for the Divine message is: "Behold the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them."

It may then be taken as the meaning of the words of our Lord in the text, that teaching which appears to be new, as it stands before us in the present, is to be judged and tested, on the one hand by a discernment founded on previous experience of the past, and by patience, waiting for the experience of the future.

The English Church Union, on behalf of whose objects we are now offering the Holy Sacrifice, represents two great causes, each of which has uttered, in its day,

a new teaching in England, and both of which must look for their justification to the Divine test of fruit—the cause of the Anglican Reformation, and the cause of the Catholic Revival.

It may seem strange that I put these two causes together. No doubt the Catholic Revival has a claim on our love and devotion, which does not seem to belong to the Reformation. We think of the sons of the Revival as those who have suffered for the truth's sake; of many of the leading Reformers as having been clothed with an undeserved greatness at the expense of truth.

The one school has seemed to revive the holiness of ancient Saints, and the heavenly truths that centre in the Christian Altar; the other seems, at first sight, to have cut itself off from all that was beautiful and moving in the devotion of the Middle Ages.

Hard indeed is it to judge men fairly who were familiar with the worse side of what we most value, to whom some of our possessions, which are so familiar that we hardly realise their blessing, such as the English Bible, were just newly recovered; it cannot be wrong, we may be sure, that our love and thankfulness should be centred on blessings which have belonged to our own time and our own experience, and on those through whom they have been bestowed.

Yet—apart from the Reformers—the position of the English Church at the moment when she had made clear and definite her refusal of the Papal claim, is our position, and recent events have shown us that it is vain to try and ignore it, in our efforts for the reunion of Christendom. However we may deplore excesses or needless reaction, we are bound to the claim made in the Sixteenth Century that history, scripture and reason justify us in refusing the Roman Monarchy over our Church.

New, indeed, did the claim seem in those days of conflict. Far away and dim in the distance lay the Eastern Churches, hardly thought of in England; long and firm had been the grasp of Rome upon the West. If it was strange to the men of those days to think of Christianity which was not Roman, still more strange

must it have been, as the Reformation began to take shape, to find in England, alongside of the rejection of the Pope, the careful retention of the Episcopal office, and the genuine appeal to Christian antiquity. In Germany and in France it had been different. The reformed position in those countries had settled down into a form like that of the Presbyterianism of our own day. And when the second generation of the English Reformers, the generation of Hooker and Andrewes, began to realise the distinctive value of what the English Church had retained, the charge of inconsistency, which has lasted to our own day, was directed against our predecessors, both from the Roman Catholic and from the Protestant side. The new teaching had to bear the ordeal to which prophets must always submit. And of the tests which our text has supplied to us, one was ready in that day, the other has been pointed out by subsequent history, as the true defences of the Anglican position.

It was possible at once to point to the past. Those who had been imbued with the spirit of the Primitive Liturgies, and who knew the doctrine of St. Ignatius of Antioch, as to the Episcopate, were able to appreciate teaching that was Catholic but not Roman Catholic; sacramental, but not subject to the scholastic refinements which were sheltered by the authority of the Roman See. The savour of Anglicanism was acceptable to those whose powers of discernment had been trained in the study of antiquity.

If the Christian Past offered support to England, in the first moments of her deplorable but inevitable isolation, much more has the experience of what then lay in the future confirmed the trust of her children.

To Dean Church we owe, as so much besides, a remarkable picture of the forlorn hope which the later Reformers seemed to be leading, and of its great success. "The English Reformation," he has said, "ventured on its tremendous undertaking, the attempt to make the Church theologically, politically, socially different, while keeping it historically and essentially the same, with what seems the most slender outfit of appliances. . . .

Its public and avowed purpose—I do not say that of all its promoters—but its public purpose was, taking the actual historical Church of Augustine and Ethelbert, of Becket and Wolsey, of Warham and Pole, the existing historical representative and descendant of that supernatural society which is traceable through all the ages to apostolic days, to assert its rights, to release it from usurpation, to purge away the evils which this usurpation had created and fostered; and accepting the Bible as the Primitive Church had accepted it, and trying to test everything by Scripture and history, to meet the immediate necessities of a crisis which called not only for abolition, but for reconstruction and replacement. . . .

Abroad, the idea of the English Reformation appeared, as it still appears abroad, an illogical and incomprehensible attempt to unite incompatible principles and elements. . . . That Reformers in England, having broken with the Pope . . . should embarrass themselves by maintaining the continuity and identity of the existing Church with the historical Church of the past, this was unintelligible. . . . It must have seemed . . . a very unpromising, if not forlorn and desperate venture. . . . It might have been plausibly foretold that the English reformed Church must soon choose its side; must soon either go backwards or forwards; backwards to its old allegiance; forwards to the clear, definite position of the great Swiss and French Reformers. . . .

. . . . The experience of three centuries has shown that the apparently loose, ill-jointed, halting polity . . . had both a firmness and an elasticity which more showy systems failed in. It has borne the brunt of time and change. It has never lost its original informing, animating idea. It has shown a wonderful power of obstinate tenacity against jars and shocks, a force of continuous growth, and of vigorous recovery after disaster and stagnation. It has certainly vindicated its claim to life and reality.”

You will forgive so long a quotation, not only because it reminds us of the strength of the Anglican position, but because it suggests the way in which we ought to look at the more recent claim of the Catholic revival.

Like the English Reformation the Oxford movement brought before men what seemed strange and novel teaching. All that is represented by the altered arrangement of so many of our churches: the central place of the Eucharist, the turning of priest and people together towards the unseen God, the homage of art and of the bended knee offered to Jesus present with us in His true Manhood on the Altar; this, and much besides, had to be judged by the tests which our Lord had given us. Could it make good its roots in the past? Would it endure for the future?

It was to vindicate the continuity with the Past that the Tracts for the Times were written, that Pusey built up his great collection of ancient testimony to the doctrine of the Real Presence, that the Fathers were translated for English readers.

Here and there—must it not be confessed?—impatience of the slower method of primitive appeal, has made our friends ready to use the ready weapons of Roman theologians, and to depreciate antiquity in the interests of development. It is no doubt far easier to take the definitions of the Council of Trent than to enquire whether they are really based upon primitive teaching. But if the later teaching as to Purgatory, as to the unreality of the outward part in the Holy Eucharist, as to the worship of the Saints, be accepted as certain and necessary, the appeal to antiquity must be given up. To give it up is certainly to give up the principle which God has committed to the custody of the English Church. To join idly in decrying antiquity and exalting mediævalism is not merely to cut away our own supports, but to be indifferent to the unchanging character of revealed truth.

But, as to the second test: can that also be applied to the Revival? Every year makes it more possible; every year supplies us with fresh facts, for which our

thankfulness is due. If we place ourselves in the position of those in authority, when the Tractarian movement arose, surely, looking back, we can see how hard it was for Bishops to accept at once all that less responsible persons were ready to adopt. This must indeed ever be a mark of high positions of trust, that their holders must be slow in accepting what seems to be new.

It was rather from leaders who left us, than from those who remained to their life's end, that denunciations of the Bishops and their utterances of fifty and forty years ago came most bitterly. To the Church at large, and especially to her rulers, the appeal of the revived teaching was made. And they were well within their rights, if they replied that they must judge by fruits; that they must wait and consider. And what has been the result? What is the attitude of those in authority to-day towards the revived Catholic teaching, as compared with that of thirty, of twenty years ago? What is the tendency of the rising School amongst us? What is the character of these new diocesan flocks, which, in communion with the See of Canterbury, are being multiplied through the world? I am old enough to remember when, in obedience to the demand of a fanatical public meeting, a Bishop withdrew the licence of a priest for hearing confessions. I have reason to remember it, for, to me, and I doubt not to many besides, the event brought home the consciousness that confession was within our reach. Is it too much to say that to-day the Bishops who would deny the liberty of confession are in a small and disappearing minority? About five and twenty years ago a large number of new or restored churches were consecrated or re-dedicated amongst us. Even in the case of so magnificent a church as that of Sherborne Abbey, I remember my sad and wistful departure, as an unconfirmed child, in the midst of the Liturgy. Even there the spirit of the day did not allow the conscience of the great Prelate who sat in St. Osmund's throne, to stand before the Altar when he uttered the words of Consecration. Perhaps it may be but seldom that in our day churches will be consecrated. We rather need to

use better those we have than to build many more, but the great Benediction of Truro Cathedral, and humbler events nearer home, tell us that the constraint and poorness of the past has become changed indeed into the glory of an ampler life. We dare not speak as if all, or nearly all, were accomplished, but in the vindication by the future, no less than in the appeal to the past, may we thankfully apply to the revival life of the English Church the test: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

What then, in view of these thoughts, shall we ask, at this sacred time? What special intention can we gather from the words of our Lord?

Hitherto we have thought of those words as they apply to the Church to which prophets come. But they have a meaning also for the prophets themselves. If the body of the Church is right in pausing till the fruit is shown, the prophet cannot pause, or the fruit will never appear. To him conviction must have come swiftly, marvellously, beyond all human knowledge. Round him are the select few that have heard his words and believed them; those for whom in one night, as it were, the rod of Aaron, for the tribe of Levi, has budded, and blossomed, and borne its fruit.

Wherever large numbers of men are gathered in the Church, there will be some who are thus touched, through the power of God's Spirit, with the electing call of prophetic life. In every great school, from time to time, there is a little group of lads, not better than their companions, exposed, indeed, to peculiar dangers and temptations, but filled in a manner they cannot explain with a sacred thirst for richer and deeper truth. In every neighbourhood, with something like the regularity of a natural law, there are the few, here and there, who by very different paths have been led to the same conviction of the reality of Catholic truth. Lonely often, not seldom troubled, discouraged, perplexed, driven, as it were, by the Spirit Himself, to keener prayer, to secret fasts, to painful study, to the courage and humility that can seek a profit by counsel, yet possessing a joy of conviction, and a firmness of purpose which can never be

lost, except through sin, such men and women as these know the sorrows and the joys of the goodly fellowship of the prophets. Can we dare to say, rather can we dare to deny, that the convictions, dearer than life, which gather such little bands as ours to-day before the altar, are the convictions of the elect of God? And if this be so, if in silence or in word, all of us are called to witness to those who, with us, adore our Lord, of the reality of His method of contact and faith, His institution of Ministry, of Church, Sacraments, as the instruments of the co-equal yet Vicarial Spirit, if we are bound to call Christians to be Churchmen, and Churchmen to be Catholics, must we not ask for patience to make good the foundations of our appeal, and patience again to wait till it is proved by the fruit of experience?

Once we have faith, patience is the whole of sanctification, for it is another name for hope, and it is the evidence of love. Let us ask that patience may have her perfect work, that they who are indeed planted by the waterside, may bring forth their fruit in due season.



TAUNTON :

PRINTED AT THE "SOMERSET COUNTY GAZETTE" OFFICE.

CONVOCAATION OF CANTERBURY.

LOWER HOUSE.

COMMITTEE* ON SUPPLY AND TRAINING OF CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS.

REPORT.

The Committee has held seven meetings, viz.: January 18, March 21, April 24, December 13, 1899, March 7, March 13, May 7, 1900.

At the first meeting the Archdeacon (Sandford) of Exeter was elected Chairman, and Canon Jelf, Secretary. It was directed that, with the permission of the Archbishop of each Province, inquiries should be made of the Secretary of the corresponding Committee of the Convocation of York, of the Secretary of the Conferences on the Training of Candidates for Holy Orders, and of the Secretary for the Ordination Candidates Fund.

Dean of St. Paul's (*Dr. Gregory*).

" Windsor (*Dr. Eliot*),

" Lichfield (*Dr. Luckock*).

Archdeacon of Berks (*Mr. Pott*).

" Kingston-on-Thames

(*Mr. Burney*).

" Chichester (*Mr. Mount*).

" Exeter (*Mr. Sandford*,

Chairman).

" Colchester (*Bishop of*

Colchester).

" Lincoln (*Mr. Kaye*).

Canon Bright, D.D.

" Bristow.

" Durst.

" Jelf.

" Warburton.

" Thompson.

" Worledge.

" Proctor.

Prebendary Ingram.

" Villiers.

Mr. Philips.

[This Report must be taken as having the authority only of the Committee by which it was prepared. The House is only responsible for the Resolutions as agreed to after discussion.]

At the second meeting the consent of the two Archbishops was announced by the Chairman, and the answers of the Secretaries above named were produced. It was also stated that the Committee of the York Convocation had wished to report simultaneously with that of the Canterbury Convocation, but owing to unavoidable delays had been obliged to proceed independently, and had on the 8th of February, 1899, issued their report, a copy of which was sent to the Secretary of the Committee of the Canterbury Convocation.

Your Committee, wishing to consult some representative clergy both upon the general subject and upon certain details, directed the secretary to invite the attendance of the Regius Professors of Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge, of the Rev. Dr. Ryle, Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, of the Rev. Dr. Robinson, Canon of Westminster, of the Rev. V. S. Stuckey Coles, Principal of the Pusey House, and of the Rev. F. J. Chavasse, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, now Bishop of Liverpool. Of these, the three last-named attended, and the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge sent a long written communication; the others were hindered by duty from coming.

At some of their later meetings the Committee had the advantage of information and advice from the Rev. J. O. Johnston, Principal of Cuddesdon College; the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, Dean of Emmanuel College, Cambridge; the Rev. Chancellor Crowfoot, of Lincoln; the Rev. Paul Petit, Secretary to the Additional Curates Society; the Rev. Dr. Warre, Head Master of Eton; and the Rev. and Hon. Edward Lyttelton, Head Master of Haileybury.

I.—HISTORICAL SKETCH, INCLUDING THE METHODS OF TRAINING CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS WHICH HAVE BEEN ADOPTED IN THE CHURCH FROM EARLY TIMES.

It has seemed desirable to your Committee with the view of illustrating the present position of the Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders, and in support of the recommendations based on this Report, to introduce the subject by a brief historical sketch, although it is impossible to do more than note the salient features of their investigations.

(a) Such an inquiry will fitly start from the first occasion when the supply and training of well-qualified candidates for the Ministry was dealt with by the Lord Himself. In St. Matt. ix., 36-38, we have the true conditions for the solution of the problem of the supply, and in the records of the education given step by step to the Apostles—as a body in the Galilean ministry, as described in the Synoptic Gospels, as individuals in that which is the special subject of St. John—there are included the principles of all true training.* The whole letter

* *The One Religion*, Bampton Lectures, 1881, by the present Bishop of Salisbury.

and spirit of that training is summarised in St. Mark, iii., 14: "And He appointed twelve, that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out devils." Special association with the Master was their training, and on the special training thus imparted their mission, identical in its purpose with His own, but secondary and dependent on His gifts, was based.

With such a training in the background, it is only natural to find in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Church that the qualifications for Ordination regarded as essential were the internal qualifications of character, to which from the first the testimony both of the clergy and the laity in the Church was required. (Acts vi. 3-6; 1 Tim. iii. 7; S. Cyprian, Ep. lv., 6 (Oxf. Library of the Fathers); *Dict. Christ. Ant.*, ii., pp. 1506-1507). The ἐπίσκοπος was, indeed, to be διδασκτικός; presbyters, who laboured "in the word and in teaching" were to receive especial recognition, but alike in the Pastoral Epistles as in the writings of S. Ignatius and S. Polycarp, it is on loyalty to the Person of the Lord Incarnate and on character that all the earliest exhortations turn (1. Tim. iii. 1-12; Titus i. 6-9; Ign. ad Philadelph., 7; Smyrn., 6; Polycarp, *Ep. ad Phil.*, 5, 6). Minute enactments in regard to qualifications generally necessary for ordination were not at first requisite, when as a rule men would be ordained in the closely-united Christian community of their own city. With the extension of the Church, stress began to be laid on tests of various kinds before admission to the Ministry.

(b) The commanding influence on the intellectual side of Christian truth, and the teaching office of the Church exercised by the Catechetical school at Alexandria, and the noble labours of S. Clement and Origen can only be barely mentioned. That school upheld before the Church a standard of devotion in theological study, consecrated by prayer, to Truth in its most comprehensive form, of which in the higher intellectual training of the clergy the influence is still potent; but the school itself was by no means exclusively intended for ministerial training.

(c) In the fourth century, as is well known, the coenobitic life came into prominence through the work of S. Basil in Cappadocia.* Almost contemporaneously with that monastic movement a system grew up, originating with Eusebius of Vercellae, of the clergy of a city living in community under the eye of the Bishop (S. Ambrose, Ep. lxiii. 66, 82). At Milan and at Rome S. Augustine (*De Mor. Eccl. Cath.*, i. 33) mentions the existence of such establishments, over which a presbyter presided. S. Augustine himself lived at Hippo in common with the clergy, and in the bishop's house it would appear that youths were educated and trained for the higher Orders of the Ministry. The ideal of the Ministry

* See Prebendary Blomfield Jackson's *Prolegomena* to S. Basil, in "Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," vol. viii. pp. lii-liv.

on its spiritual and ethical side, at this period, may be gathered from such works as the three books by S. Ambrose on the Duties of Ministers; S. Jerome's eulogy of the young Nepotian (Letter LX. *ad Heliodorum*), who 'by constant reading and meditation had made his breast a library of Christ; and in S. Chrysostom's treatise *De Sacerdotio*, which might have been entitled "the Ideal of a Bishop," or in works so familiar as those by S. Augustine *de Fide et Symbolo, de catechizandis rudibus*, and the *Enchiridion de Fide, Spe, et Caritate*, there is ample evidence of assiduous care on behalf of the teaching capacity of the clergy when ordained. Nor should the noble work and beneficent influence of the Abbey of Lérins in the fifth century be forgotten.

(d) By examples such as these it may certainly be inferred that the leaders of the Church were far from indifferent to the intellectual as well as the spiritual equipment of candidates for Ordination also; but the first well established enactment with regard to literary qualifications proceeds, not from ecclesiastical sources, but from the ecclesiastical 'Novels' of Justinian issued between A.D. 535 and 565 (Novell. 6, 123, and 127). Not long afterwards, S. Gregory the Great, by his own personal example and influence, as illustrated by his *Regula Pastoralis*, did much to raise the ordinary standard of attainment. S. Benedict had already (A.D. 530) founded the great order whose contributions to learning have been so immense, and in monastic and episcopal schools, an education was provided—though, for the most part of an elementary and narrow kind—mainly shaped in character and subjects for lads intended for the priesthood. In the Western Church, the standard rose, as in the East it declined. Occasionally, as—to name English examples only—at Canterbury, York, or Jarrow, the ideal of study was exceptional in its culture and its fulness.

(e) It was to the educational reforms of Charles the Great and the little group of learned ecclesiastics promoted by him that the Church owed, directly or indirectly, through large parts of Europe, the revival of the Monastic, and the institution of the Cathedral Schools for the education of young clerks,* while the 'Palace School' over which Alcuin presided was primarily, though not exclusively, intended as a nursery for the future Bishops and Abbots of the Frankish Empire. During the greater part of the period known as 'the Benedictine era' (circa A.D. 814-1180) the work of the Cathedral Schools was eclipsed by that of the Monasteries, but nevertheless it was the Cathedral School of Paris under William of Champeaux, its Chancellor, which eventually developed into the earliest and greatest university of Northern Europe. In the development of the Cathedral Chapters in different parts of Northern and Western Europe, and especially in Normandy and England, the Chancellor of

* The Capitularies on these subjects were issued in 787 and 789.

the Church was charged with the duty of theological instruction, and read lectures chiefly, no doubt, on the canon law and scholastic theology in the capitular school, which it was his office 'to rule' (e.g. Lincoln Cathedral Statutes, *Liber Niger*, p. 284). But besides the internal Cathedral School, external schools for more elementary instruction were attached to some Cathedral Foundations, and there is, certainly, strong historical precedent to look to Cathedral Chapters for aid and guidance, not only in direct ministerial training before and after ordination, but also in the earlier period of education during boyhood of lads who appear to be called to the priesthood.

(f) In his learned work on *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, Dr. Rashdall has shown that the Mediæval University as such supplied but little 'religious education' for the future priest. "The 'religious education' of a 'bygone Oxford' . . . was," he writes (vol. ii. pp. 701-702), "an inheritance, not from the Middle Ages, but from the Reformation. In [Roman] Catholic Europe it was the product of the counter-reformation. Until that time the Church provided as little professional education for the future Priest as it did 'religious instruction' for the ordinary layman. Seminaries for the Priest, catechisms and careful preparation for first communion, whether at the Universities or elsewhere, are the product of the counter-reformation, not of the Middle Age. The whole Mediæval University system, even the Collegiate system* in the developed form which it had attained by the end of the fifteenth century, was about as unlike the modern seminary as anything that can well be imagined. . . . Not only the Universities but even the Bishops seem, in so far as they required any real standard of learning from Candidates for Holy Orders, to have insisted mainly on secular learning." At the Universities, men with expectations of higher ecclesiastical preferment went to study canon law; the intermediate grade of clergy were, for the most part, content with a degree in Arts; and of 'the great tribe' of the inferior clergy only a small proportion had a University degree, although many went for some short period to a University to study. Thus, e.g., in the Episcopal Registers of Bishop John de Grandisson of Exeter (A.D. 1327-1369) licenses of non-residence for this purpose are frequently recorded.

(g) And it is alike interesting and suggestive to notice that, first, the mendicant, and, afterwards, the monastic orders were almost irresistibly drawn to keep in touch with the literary activities of the Universities. They not only established colleges at the Universities, such as the Franciscan school at Oxford, "in which Master Robert Grosteste of holy memory was persuaded

* Walter de Merton's Statutes of 1270, which suggested 'the model of all other collegiate foundations' (*History of the University of Oxford*, by the Hon. G. C. Brodrick, p. 18) are a sufficient illustration.

to read lectures to the brethren," but from all the greater monasteries in East Anglia young monks were sent as 'pensioners' to Gonville Hall, as novices from Durham Priory were "sent to Oxford to school, and there did learn to study Divinity." (*Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College*, by Dr. John Venn, pp. xvi.-xviii.; and *The Rites of Durham*, Surtees Society.) It is well to remember that in the Middle Ages the literary training of the English clergy, however imperfect, was not dis-severed from the higher forms of culture, thought, and action, and that, even in the progress of devoted work for the spiritual and physical welfare of the lowest of the people, Franciscans, whose founder abjured all human learning, were forced, in grappling with their work, to study its principles. Thus the noble schemes of men like Warham, Fisher, Wolsey, Colet, More, and Erasmus, were but developments of a long tradition that had never been entirely broken.

(h) In the earlier half of the seventeenth century Oxford and Cambridge had attained in the country a very commanding position, and it is not altogether satisfactory to note that, in regard to the supply of the clergy sent out into the country, they have by no means regained an influence held 270 years ago. Dr. H. Venn has stated, in a work referred to above (pp. xx., xxi.), that Cambridge then supplied an annual contingent of about 207 graduate clergy. Its present supply is about 230. And yet the population of the country has multiplied, at least, fourfold. The actual numbers from Oxford would appear to have risen only from 172 to 219.

(i) As has already been stated, the specialisation of technical training for the Ministry really dates from the sixteenth century. In the Roman Catholic Church, the Council of Trent at its twenty-third session, July 15th, 1563, dealt with the subject of Order, examination for Ordination, and the establishment of Seminaries (Sess. xxiii. cap. xviii.). These disciplinary reforms, especially with regard to the seminary training, were effectually promoted by the efforts of the Jesuit Order and the devotion of S. Francis Xavier; in Italy, by S. Philip Neri and the congregation of Oratorians, and afterwards, at Milan, by S. Carlo Borromeo; in France, by the founders of the Oratoire, Cardinal de Bérulle and Charles de Condron, S. Vincent de Paul and the Lazarists, M. Olier and the Saint Sulpiciens. In France the whole lump was leavened, and the clergy were prepared to meet the trials of the Great Revolution. There are, no doubt, things to avoid in the movements to which reference has been made, but there is also not a little to learn.

(k) Among the Lutherans, and other Reformed Communions on the Continent, as among the Presbyterians in Scotland, the Ministers have taken, and still take, largely as theological students, a university course, after which—at least in Germany—

they may enter a theological seminary for further study, combined with practical training.

(1) Until the present century little has been done in the Church of England for the special training of the clergy. In the statutes proposed in the reign of Henry VIII. for the Cathedrals of the New Foundation, Archbishop Cranmer (Strype, *Mem. Cranmer*, i. p. 107) undoubtedly intended to make them centres of religious instruction and missionary preaching, and especially of training for the Ministry. Cathedral schools for boys were either founded or refounded with the special, though not exclusive intention of educating lads who desired to be eventually ordained. In Statutes afterwards put forth in the reign of Elizabeth, but never confirmed, the same design was contemplated. Under the Canons (31 to 35) of 1604 admission to Holy Orders was more carefully guarded, examinations were ordered, and literary qualifications definitely stated, while in the reformed Ordinal an ideal, noble and comprehensive, of the functions of the Ministry was exhibited. In the 18th century two attempts, on truly primitive lines, to enable men to realise that ideal deserve attention. During his episcopate at Salisbury (A.D. 1689-1714) Bishop Burnet "resolved at his own charges to maintain a small nursery of students in divinity, who might follow their studies till he should be able to provide for them." In the Isle of Man, Bishop Thomas Wilson received into his own house all his Candidates for Holy Orders, for at least a year before the time of Ordination, watching over their conduct, guiding their studies, especially in the Greek Testament, and directing their pursuits. To the S. P. G. the Bishop in 1707 proposed the establishment of a missionary college, so that the foundation of S. Augustine's, Canterbury, and of our theological colleges, was anticipated in that island diocese about 150 years before they came into existence.

II.—PRESENT SYSTEMS OF TRAINING (A) IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND (B) IN OTHER PARTS OF CHRISTENDOM.

(A) (a) Although the special training of Candidates for Holy Orders in the Church of England is, in the main, a product of the last sixty years, it would be unfair to the memory of many devout and learned men who laboured before that period to suppose that no pains were taken in so serious a matter. The work of Laud in his chancellorship at Oxford, and also at Dublin, is now generally admitted to have been a great contribution to theological learning and the intellectual training of the clergy. But during the eighteenth and the earlier half of the nineteenth centuries the subject was not forgotten. Bishop Burnet's *Discourse of the Pastoral Care* and Bishop Bull's *Companion for the*

Candidates of Holy Orders are instances to the contrary. In Robert Nelson's *Life of Bishop Bull*, we have from a devout layman's pen a sketch of 'the advantage of seminaries for the Candidates of Holy Orders,' and 'of the fruit to be reaped from them.' While Daniel Waterland was dean and tutor of Magdalene College, Cambridge, he drew up a scheme, entitled *Advice to a Young Student*, intended as a guide not to study only, but also to a habit of devotion, assuming that the generality of his pupils were 'intended for clergymen.' Examples could be given of lists of books recommended for ordinary Candidates for Holy Orders, and, as was the case at Wells in 1745, of the examination of Candidates, not only by the Bishop, but by the Dean and Chapter. As early as 1819 the attention of the Universities was drawn by Dr. Monk and Dr. Kaye, while holding respectively their Greek and Divinity Professorships at Cambridge, to the need of a more distinctive theological education for Candidates for Ordination. Personal efforts such as Mr. Simeon's 'Instruction Classes' and 'Conversation Parties' at Cambridge, and books such as Richard Cecil's *Remarks on the Christian Ministry*, or Bishop C. Sumner's *Ministerial Character of Christ* produced a deep impression. There is no need to do more than mention the effect of Mr. Newman's sermons at St. Mary's, Oxford, between 1830-40, or, in the succeeding decade, Bishop Harvey Goodwin's great influence as a preacher, while Incumbent of St. Edward's, Cambridge, and the teaching of Professor J. J. Blunt's lecture-room. It may be doubted whether later methods, although so highly organised, can show in the Ministry results more fruitful and far-reaching than are associated with some of the personal efforts here mentioned. Your Committee have ventured to recall them because they believe that much can still be done, in similar ways, to improve alike the supply, and preparation of not a few Candidates for Ordination.

(b) During their University course at Oxford and Cambridge many efforts are being made to help and influence young men, who are already seeking Holy Orders, by the Divinity Professors, the college authorities, and other residents in those Universities. Of theological teaching as distinct from training for the Ministry of the Church, there is an ample and growing supply, developing an immense power among younger students, resident at Oxford and Cambridge. But the real function of the University teaching of the Theological Faculty will always be misunderstood, unless it is distinctly realised that a Board of Theological Studies is an academic body, and not the servant of the Church. It is responsible to the University and not to the Episcopate, and its members have to do with theology, or criticism, or hermeneutics as branches of learning. Yet it would, in many ways, be a grave misfortune if certificates of attendance at lectures of Divinity Professors ceased to be generally required

of Candidates for Holy Orders, even although they spend a year at a Theological College. Several graduates, now content with a pass-degree, could perfectly well take a class in the Theological Honours School, the advantages of which would be spiritual and moral as well as intellectual. There is, moreover, high authority for stating that, among undergraduates of the ordinary type, the interest created by Divinity Professors' lectures has evoked study, and it is undeniable that some of those lectures are largely, and often voluntarily attended. At some of the colleges, work of a more direct kind is done in helping undergraduates to keep a true ideal of the Ministry before them. Those who are definitely contemplating ordination are invited in each term to attend a special service with an address. At Cambridge, where there is no chair of Pastoral Theology, the institution of a yearly course of pastoral lectures by a Bishop, or some well-known parish priest, has had most encouraging results, and at both Universities a very large amount of practical work in the parishes, or else in connexion with College Missions, is being done by undergraduates and B.A.'s. Still, to use a sentence of the Bishop of Durham (*Cathedral Foundations in relation to Religious Thought*, "Essays on Cathedrals," p. 118), while "it would be disastrous to separate clerical education generally from the highest liberal education of the country, the theological education at a University can (in the case of Candidates for Holy Orders) be only preparatory."

(c) This was the conviction which prompted the foundation of those Theological Colleges for graduates to which the Church of England owes a deep debt of gratitude. The colleges at Chichester (originally intended for graduates), at Wells under Canon Pinder, at Cuddesdon, at Salisbury, and at Ely, were all due to episcopal initiative, and the Clergy School at Leeds had, from the first, the sanction of Bishop Robert Bickersteth, whose successor is now the visitor. 'Three-fold object of residence here, (1) Devotion, (2) Parochial Work, (3) Theological Reading,' was Bishop Wilberforce's summary of the aims of Cuddesdon. 'Men humble, thoughtful, careful, patient, and simple lovers of Christ's truth, lovers of men's souls, men whose lives may accord with the goodly pattern of old Church of England piety,' was his aspiration for the character of its students, and those aims and that character could not be expressed in better terms in regard to any Theological College, with whatever 'school of thought' it may be more or less associated. At Cambridge "the Clergy Training School" meets "a need felt by many graduates, who are looking forward to Ordination, of a systematic preparation for their life's work which does not demand the sacrifice of the peculiar advantages afforded by residence in the University." The two 'Theological Halls,' Wycliffe at Oxford and Ridley at Cambridge, have been established for the education of clergymen in the 'Evangelical principles of the Church of

England,' and have both maintained a high standard of devotion and theological training. Nor may two other remarkable societies be forgotten. At Auckland Castle the Bishop's house has become the home of many Candidates for the Ministry, with results, during two Episcopates, of a striking character in the diocese of Durham.* From 1861 to 1897, first at Doncaster and then at the Temple and Llandaff, more than 450 graduates were received by Dr. Vaughan for preparation for Holy Orders. "Never probably has there been a deeper or more lasting bond between master and scholars than existed between him and successive generations of his pupils." †

(d) Since its foundation, in 1832, the University of Durham has made provision for a course of theological study, and, especially among the earlier students, it has trained some clergymen whose power and devotion have been conspicuous. At Trinity College, Dublin, the Divinity School has for long been of inestimable value to the clergy of the Church of Ireland, and probably its reputation and usefulness as a place of training for the Ministry never stood higher than at the present moment.

(e) This century has, however, witnessed in the Church of England the development of training at several Theological and Missionary Colleges of non-graduate Candidates for Ordination. Since the foundation by Bishop Law, of Chester, in 1816, of S. Bee's College, which until 1896, when it was closed, educated a very large number of men for the Ministry, many colleges of this kind have been founded, of which the majority are still doing work at once most useful and necessary. At some, as at Lichfield, founded by Bishop Lonsdale, graduates and non-graduates are trained together; at others, as at the Scholæ Cancellarii, Lincoln, revived by Archbishop Benson during his Chancellorship in that Cathedral, mainly through the munificence of Bishop Chr. Wordsworth, and St. Aidan's, Birkenhead, the non-graduate element predominates. St. John's Hall, Highbury, opened in 1863, has an object, similar to Wycliffe and Ridley Halls, in the training of non-graduates, and to it especially several men have resorted after earlier years spent in business and commercial pursuits. The group of Missionary Colleges, now seven in number, train, almost entirely, non-graduates. At most of these colleges the main deficiencies are larger endowments, a larger teaching staff and instruction in some subjects other than theological; and, instead of further multiplication, some grouping might be far more desirable.

(f) Two colleges stand in a position peculiar to themselves.

* At York for a few years a similar 'Bishop's School' was established, and at Ripon and Farnham Castle some efforts have been made in a similar direction.

† *Dict. of National Biography*, Art. C. J. Vaughan.

At St. David's College, Lampeter, which has the power of granting certain degrees, many of the clergy of the dioceses in Wales receive a literary and theological training. The contrast between the education of the Welsh clergy now and as Bishop Burgess, the founder of St. David's College, found it in the early years of the present century at Ystradmeurig Grammar School, especially when the Lampeter course is supplemented by a year's special training at St. Michael's College, Aberdare, is striking indeed. In the Theological Department of King's College, London, founded in 1847 by Dr. Jelf, many hundreds of non-graduate students have received instruction from distinguished teachers in close connexion with a great educational centre. It might be well that in connexion with the new Universities from which some graduates are beginning to take Holy Orders, hostels could be erected at which they could reside during their academic career, and at one such centre a Theological College established at which a training could be given specially adapted to their circumstances and needs.*

(g) To assist Candidates for Ordination in their general education, or their special training, very considerable efforts have been made, especially during the last 25 years. At the Universities, in addition to some older scholarships and exhibitions, of which a careful schedule has been recently compiled by the Rev. W. Foxley Norris, Vicar of Almondbury, a considerable number of new ones have been founded. Since its foundation in 1873, the Ordination Candidates' Exhibition Fund has given assistance to 681 men, and has on its list 97 students in the present year. Though comparatively small in amount, the "Cambridge Graduates' Ordination Fund" has secured special training for a large number of men who, without its aid, could not have obtained it. Nor should it be forgotten that a very considerable amount of help is given privately to Candidates for Ordination by munificent clergymen and laymen.

(h) By the establishment of the 'Preliminary Examination for Holy Orders' in 1874, and through recommendations made by 'the Conferences on the Training of Candidates for Holy Orders' held under the sanction of the Episcopate at intervals since 1881, when the first of such gatherings met, under Dr. Westcott's presidency at Cambridge, a good deal has been done in the direction of consolidating and improving the examinations for Ordination. Of the spiritual preparation in the Embertide, it hardly comes within the province of your Committee to speak. That a vast improvement has taken place alike in the Embertide devotions and the administration of

* See a paper on 'University Colleges and the Training of the Clergy' (*Report of the Church Congress, Rhyl.* 1891, p. 233), and on 'Theological Colleges and University Colleges' (*Report of the Church Congress, Nottingham*, 1897, p. 411), by Dr. G. H. Rendall.

Holy Orders is patent to all, but it may be doubted if, even now, Churchmen at large fully appreciate the importance of the change, or are aware of the debt of gratitude due to the Bishops of the Church in a matter, which concerns not the clergy only, but the whole spirit and tone of their ministrations to the laity. It can only be added here, that in the Colonial and Missionary branches of the Anglican Communion, the methods of training Candidates for Ordination adopted in the Mother Church, and the improvements effected at home have been largely followed. From the date of its General Convention in Philadelphia in 1789 to the present time, our daughter Church in the United States of America has, by its Canons, made admission of Candidates to Holy Orders a subject of most anxious public concern. The General Theological Seminary at New York, established in 1817, grows, with advancing years, in its devotion to Christ and His Church, in its efficiency of teaching and equipment, and in the number of its students. In the Scottish Episcopal Church the Canons are not less careful, and its Theological College at Edinburgh, founded in 1810, can look back on 90 years of useful labour.

(B) At the Conference on the training of Candidates for Holy Orders held at Oxford in April, 1882, a Report of a Committee on "Methods pursued by the Church of England and other Christian Bodies in training men for the Ministry" was presented. It was based on prolonged and careful inquiries in England, Scotland, Ireland, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, and America. In this Report it would be impossible to enter into the details of so large a subject. Speaking generally, the comparison instituted showed that (1) our own training, while retaining its distinctive breadth and English characteristics, should be more systematic; (2) the habit of devotion more carefully regulated and cultivated; (3) the course should be longer; (4) instruction in homiletics and pastoral care more thorough; (5) further training given to the best men whose character and work justify their selection for it; (6) the general interest of all the members of the Church evoked far more largely, alike in the supply and training of those who are responsible for the worship of the Triune God and ministrations to the souls of men.

III.—PRESENT FACTS AS TO THE SUPPLY OF CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

In the opinion of your Committee there is at the present time a great need of duly-qualified persons to serve in the ministry of the Church—a growing need of clergy, suitable in social status, intellectually equipped, and spiritually disciplined, for the

Church's work in town and country, in school and lecture-room, among rich and poor.

The number, all told, of candidates each year bears no proper proportion to the growth of the population; and it is increasingly difficult, alike in rural districts and in great cities, to obtain efficient assistant-curates, even if it is possible, as oftentimes it is not possible, to find sufficient funds for their support.

For the confirmation of this statement, the Committee appeal to the following facts as to the supply of Candidates for Holy Orders in the Church of England:

(1) In regard to quantity.—During the three years ended December 31st, 1898, the ordinations to the Diaconate were 1,994, whereas for the period of three years ended December 31st, 1888, they were 2,324. There was thus a yearly decrease to the extent of 110, while the population was growing at a rate of 300,000 a year, and required a yearly increase of 100 additional clergy.

The serious need may be illustrated in another way. The Additional Curates Society has ascertained that at the present time (April, 1900) there are quite 100 incumbents who require, but cannot obtain, assistant clergy. Most of these are in large towns and suburban parishes, where the insufficiency of ministerial help is specially deplorable. But of course the need is much greater than can be ascertained by any one society. In Birmingham alone, for instance, 82 clergymen were recently required at once over and above the number of those already at work. A similar condition of things is to be found in other populous centres of industry, *e.g.* Manchester, Cardiff, and the mining districts.

(2) In regard to quality.—If we estimate this intellectually, it might be thought sufficient to say, that of the 18,000 (in round numbers) ordained deacons, in the course of 16 years up to the end of 1896, about 12,500 had graduated at Oxford and Cambridge, but that the proportion of graduates is diminishing, and now reaches only 61 per cent. from those Universities.

The Committee note, however, that the number of graduates from Dublin, Durham, and other Universities is increasing.

But it is evident that a University degree is not in itself an adequate test. The quality of the Ordination Candidates can be gauged by the judgment of the Regius Professors, the Examining Chaplains, the Principals of Theological Colleges, and the Bishops themselves, as well as by that of the more thoughtful and earnest laity. So far as your Committee can ascertain, that judgment seems fairly agreed as to the improvement in the Candidates. Many of them are industrious and enthusiastic, and show an intelligent appreciation of the teaching which they receive. In this connexion it may be mentioned that teachers in considerable numbers seek Holy Orders. It is true that 40 or 50 years ago, men who took high degrees at the Universities as a

matter of course for the most part were ordained, and that this is no longer the case; but on the other hand, masters and assistant-masters at our great schools are often ordained after obtaining their appointments. The mental power and position of such men are thus consecrated to the higher service. Probably most men will agree that while we have a less learned clergy, we have a better trained one, and with a more varied equipment.

If again we regard quality from the spiritual side, we may rejoice in the devout spirit shown by many of the younger clergy and evinced first of all in the months of their candidature.

With whatever drawbacks this spiritual growth is a very noticeable thing. An old clergyman who died thirty years ago, himself one of the best of men, spoke of it as the most noticeable thing in his long life. As a rule the spiritual tone of the young clergyman is the development of the spiritual tone which moved him as a Candidate for Holy Orders.

Your Committee note, however, that in the last few years there have been some signs of self-indulgent habits creeping in, and reviving in a different, but not less objectionable form, the secularism of a bygone generation. They contrast unfavourably with the self-discipline of the first members of the Oxford Movement and the unworldliness of the early 'Evangelicals.' It must also be added that this inquiry, which you have entrusted to your Committee, would never have been suggested had it not been very generally felt that there is great room for improvement in the condition of our Ordination Candidates, and that many men who have been ordained show too little sense of vocation, while many more are dissuaded or repelled from seeking Holy Orders by various circumstances.

IV.—CAUSES OF PRESENT CONDITIONS.

What these circumstances are we proceed to consider.

1. First, there is a good healthy cause which has much weight. There is a truer estimate of the significance of Holy Orders. Men have learnt that ordination means not merely change of dress but change of 'character,' and implies both a life of devotion and a devoted life. If this deters people from Holy Orders, may we ever have such a deterrent!

2. Next, there is a difficulty to which, as practical Churchmen, we must assign an important place—the financial difficulty.

Before ordination there comes the heavy expense of preparation, and also the competition of other professions, offering immediate, if moderate, support. And after it there looms the inadequate prospect of a life-long curacy, or of an incumbency with diminished and still diminishing income. It is only natural that this should

weigh with young men, and specially with their parents and guardians.

3. It is believed by many that there is a very different dissuasive besides, in the unsettlement of religious belief, the disturbing criticism of the Holy Scriptures, the sceptical tone in Society, the prevailing differences between different sections of the Church. To this it may be added that the trend of clerical interest, at the present time, shows some disproportionate attention to the functional side of the ministerial office, with diminution of interest in the pastoral side.

The indifference, worldliness, and materialism prevailing in large sections of society tend also both to deter men from seeking Holy Orders, and to suppress the higher qualities needful for the clerical office. Your Committee were told that comparatively few parents thought of Holy Orders as an eligible calling for their sons, and the fact may be in part attributed to this cause.

We have no evidence, however, to show that religious doubts affect boys so far as to keep them back frequently from Holy Orders, though it is evident that some of our Public Schools provide but a small number of Candidates. At the Universities, especially at Cambridge, so much is done for Candidates by the Deans of Colleges, and the Divinity Professors, and the Incumbents of Churches, that Candidates can take heart and go forward.

4. Inadequate educational training is answerable for some of the defects of the Ministry. Some men, though intending from childhood to be clergymen, and many more as making this resolve much later, fail to secure sufficient preparation. Prevented, perhaps, from having the advantage of the general training at a university, or interrupted by the calls of business, or unable to give the time for a year's special course of instruction in a theological college, they feel hampered all their lives by lack of knowledge, or loss of discipline, or ignorance of Church doctrine. Devotion of life and earnestness of endeavour wherever they are found never fail to produce fruit; but the lack of adequate equipment in the ministers of the Church becomes a more grievous blemish in proportion as the standard of knowledge rises in the community at large. Fatal injury may be inflicted if Christianity, through the inefficiency of its teachers, fails to stand in its right relation to the widening thought of modern times.

V.—RECOMMENDATIONS.

The facts have thus been presented, and may be summarised as follows. The number of Candidates for Holy Orders is falling off. The diminution may be temporary, due in part to

passing causes; but in face of increasing population, it is a very serious consideration. The quality of Candidates from the intellectual point of view is at least maintained. Possibly the Theological student in the stricter sense is less frequently met with among the Parochial clergy; but the general Educational level is higher than formerly. Yet the progress does not keep pace with the increasing demands made by the higher educational standard of those to whom the clergy minister. From the religious and spiritual point of view the level, speaking generally, is certainly higher; but here, again, the demands and expectations are greater. Clerical character for the most part reaches a high standard of respectability and morality, but the highest credentials of the truth of Christianity as a Divine revelation will be increasingly sought in these later days in the tokens which its chief representatives give, that they are inspired by a spiritual and supernatural power. The clergy must rise yet higher, if these are to be forthcoming.

The causes of our present difficulties have also been brought before us.

They are partly financial, partly religious, partly educational.

It remains for your Committee to make such recommendations, having regard to what they have learnt as to facts and causes, as are consistent with the past history of the Anglican Ministry—a subject dealt with in Section I.

The falling-off in the number of those seeking Holy Orders is largely due to financial causes, and financial remedies will find a place amongst these recommendations. But your Committee are of opinion that if the calling of Holy Orders were rightly conceived of, and the preparation for it were fully adequate, such a healthy enthusiasm would be roused as would do more than anything else to increase both the quantity and the quality of supply. Their first recommendations have reference to this consideration.

1. Family tone and tradition is perhaps the most potent influence in determining the choice of a profession. It is not at present favourable to the choice of Holy Orders, and your Committee suggest, that it would be well if the parochial clergy were urged by the Bishops of the Church, both in their private and public ministrations, and especially at the Ember Seasons, to set before their parishioners the duty laid upon the Church of providing an adequate supply of clergy, and to exhort parents to consider the high dignity of the clerical profession, with a view to recommending it to their sons as their calling in life.

2. The influence of the home is soon supplemented by that of the school, and school life will tell for or against the choice of Holy Orders. Your Committee deprecate any premature specialising of boys with a view to the clerical profession, but

they are of opinion that in times when the higher purposes of life are often not realized, opportunities should be taken of impressing upon the young the importance of a sense of vocation. They believe that when the more earnest view of life has been once taken, it will often lead boys eventually to turn their thoughts to Holy Orders. They are therefore glad to hear of the invitations that are now often given by school authorities to clergymen and laymen of high standing to speak to the pupils on subjects connected with vocation in its higher and more general sense. It is satisfactory to be assured by such signs, and by the increasing interest taken in public school missions, of the desire of the public school authorities to maintain the connexion which has for so long existed between culture and religion. The historical review given in Section 1 shows the closeness of that connexion, and also points out how largely general culture has always entered into the training of the English clergy. No thoughtful man desires to change that tradition. Wide sympathies and a fully stored mind are increasingly necessary for the Christian teacher. It will not, however, be forgotten that if there are influences at work in our schools helpful to the maintenance of the old connexion, there are others that militate against it. The proportion of boys from some of our public schools who eventually take Holy Orders is very small, and though it is probably true that boys are not consciously deterred from contemplating the Ministry as their profession by uncertainties of religious belief, yet the aloofness of many of the younger teachers from Christian dogma may imperceptibly give a distaste. Even if the teacher never says a word on the subject, his attitude towards it is understood, and alienates the pupil's mind. At any rate there is a lack of that positive sympathy which acts so powerfully in attracting the young towards those things which a good teacher really loves. Your Committee therefore urge that Churchmen should be vigilant to secure that under the approaching settlement of secondary education there shall be a sufficient supply of schools where the tone and teaching may be relied on as generally favourable to the choice of Holy Orders. This end can be gained without the creation of schools of an exclusively ecclesiastical type, and it will be gained if Churchmen are only in earnest.

3. Secularising tendencies have progressed further at the Universities than at the Public Schools, but your Committee emphatically affirm that the ordinary University course provides still the best general educational training for Holy Orders. Moreover, they are of opinion that the opportunities which the Universities afford of studying theology in its widest relations, and under some of its highest aspects, will greatly make for that maintenance of the dignity and interest of the calling of the Ministry on which they so largely rely for its power to attract

Candidates of higher gifts and attainments. Your Committee, therefore, note with gratitude the steps which are now taken at the Universities to stimulate the taste for sacred study, and to help and influence those who are seeking Holy Orders. The efforts made at Cambridge within some of the colleges themselves seem to them to be specially worthy of commendation, as tending to place the student's immediate environment in sympathy with the purpose of his contemplated life. Few things are more serviceable to high interests than indirect efforts to secure that the Universities as such shall still be places of religious training.

4. It is evident, however, that the Universities cannot by themselves give the technical preparation that is required. Still less can they supply the essential spiritual and pastoral training. Different supplemental systems have been adopted. Your Committee express no preference for any one of them above the rest; it is best to say that they suit the different needs in individual Candidates, and should be chosen accordingly.

(a) Bursaries, studentships, and exhibitions, tenable at the Universities themselves, offer the advantage of the wide intellectual atmosphere of University life. Some of the most promising of the young clergy have been trained under this system, and it is worthy of hearty support and full recognition among the agencies for special preparation. The system might perhaps be extended so as to be available not only for graduates, but also, under special conditions as to supervision, for those who, without matriculating, may yet be able to avail themselves of some of the advantages of the Universities. Opportunities should always be given for the students under the system to receive pastoral training in one or other of the parishes of the University Town. There are, however, many who feel the need of a complete withdrawal from University surroundings before ordination; the system is not suitable for these; and even when the exhibitions and bursaries are held at hostels situated in the Universities, such as Wycliffe Hall at Oxford, Ridley Hall at Cambridge, or in connexion with the Clergy School at Cambridge, the immediate proximity of the Universities may deprive the holders of something of that more spiritual atmosphere which they desire.

(b) Clerical homes have sometimes given the best possible preparation for Holy Orders. They are unrivalled in supplying the pastoral atmosphere. Dr. Vaughan has afforded the best illustration of the successful working of this method of preparation. Others, however, had tried it with success before that ideal representative of the "Informator" of the Anglican Parish Clergyman. The following testimony, to be found in the Bampton Lectures of 1861, is based on personal experience, which was gained by trial of this system more than half a century ago:

"I am myself mainly in favour of a course of teaching and training supplemental to the Universities, and of a more practical

character than can be gained in the institutions just alluded to (Theological Colleges), such as may be furnished in a well-ordered parish, under the supervision of an incumbent of adequate ability and experience. And my judgment is confirmed by an opinion recently expressed by a Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to report on the means of Divine Worship in populous districts.* It has always appeared to me that the insight into pastoral work—the practice in the schools—the home visitation—the acquaintance with parochial machinery—the contact with the middle and poorer classes—the points, in fact, in which our younger clergy are generally and, under existing circumstances, necessarily so deficient—would be better attained in this than in any other way. I had for some years such a system in operation in a parish of my own, and I shall always look back to it with pleasure. Candidates for Holy Orders, when graduates of the University, in such a relation, are rather a help, than a hindrance, to a clergyman. The daily service of the Church, the common course of study, the interchange of thought on subjects of mutual interest, the joint supervision of the poor, are not more profitable to those who are thus initiated into Pastoral life, than to their instructor. It, therefore, seems to me that the distribution of such groups of clerical students throughout a Diocese would prove of signal benefit to the English Church, and supply its Ministry with just the class of pastors that the exigencies of the country and the character of our people call for.” These words were spoken by an old pioneer in Church work, the author of “*Parochialia*,” a book on Pastoral work not yet forgotten by some of the elder clergy—and they are still true to the needs of clerical training. Your Committee, therefore, heartily recommend this method, in the hands of carefully-selected parochial clergymen, as a system of training graduate candidates for Holy Orders, and trust that it may take its place side by side with other special methods, and receive equal recognition from the Bishops of the Church. Experience has proved that the system may with advantage be employed, not only for the training of Candidates for the Ministry, but for the fuller training of those who have already been admitted to the Diaconate.

(c) But as regards spiritual atmosphere, the Theological College is possessed of very special merits. It has its disadvantages. Many would admit that the system has a tendency to intensify party distinctions, and to give party complexion;

* “There can be no doubt,” observed the Committee, “as to the value of a practice frequently adopted by young men, previous to Ordination, of placing themselves under the care of an experienced clergyman, who can at once superintend their theological studies and gradually initiate them into the Pastoral duties of their future office, and we regret that this practice cannot be universally introduced.” *Report*, page 17.

but none will deny that the Church is under great obligations to them for having raised the whole intellectual and spiritual level of the Anglican Priesthood. Some inquiries which your Committee made were candidly met, and misconceptions on certain points were removed. Your Committee recommend them to the grateful recognition of Churchmen, and at the same time they venture to lay emphasis on three special points, as bearing closely upon the continued and increasing usefulness of these colleges:

(α) the importance of a full study of the Bible as the basis of dogmatics and sacred learning;

(β) insistence on a due place being assigned to the pastoral side of the clerical office:

(γ) The preservation of close personal relations between the college and the Bishop of the diocese.

5. Your Committee are of opinion that special technical training by one or other of the methods here indicated should as far as possible be secured for *all* Candidates for Holy Orders; but at the same time they are yet more deeply impressed with the supreme importance of raising the spiritual level of the clergy, from a consciousness that nothing less than manifestation of real spirituality of tone and life will bring home the truth of Christianity as a Divine revelation to the mass of our people. While assured that the institutions and methods referred to have done very much for clerical aim and life, their experience nevertheless shows that, even yet, much remains to be done towards the spiritual elevation of character. Your Committee are impressed with the fact that there are still many in the ranks of the English clergy who would have made good laymen, but have not those special qualifications which fit them to be good clergymen; they believe that their admission to Holy Orders is a hindrance to the work of the Church, as impairing her claims in the eyes of the people to be a Divine Society, and they venture respectfully to bring these considerations before the Bishops with reference to their choice of Candidates; it is their conviction that by raising the spiritual level of the clergy, and thus exalting the real dignity of the clerical office, a fuller appeal would be made to the heart and conscience of Churchmen, which would ultimately increase the supply of Ministers.

6. It also appears to your Committee that more might be done than at present for the promotion of study and the maintenance of a high standard of life amongst those who have already been ordained. Parochial experience shows that the tone in these respects not unfrequently deteriorates after Ordination. In their judgment the period of the Diaconate might become more useful if it were possible to make more careful selection in respect of the Incumbents permitted to give nominations, and if the duty of seeing that the younger clergy were allowed time for study and were helped in their reading, were pressed home upon those to

whom they were licensed. Few responsibilities can be graver than to give a title for Orders; the greatness of the responsibility needs more recognition, and the system under which titles are given requires considerable revision. Many clergymen look back with gratitude to the training received during the early years of their Ministry at centres, such as Leeds, under Dr. Hook, or Kidderminster, under Canon Claughton, which were for many Deacons veritable Clergy Schools. During the Diaconate also it would often be possible, as Bishop Westcott suggested in his essay on "Cathedrals in relation to Modern Thought," to bring the Deacons together for short courses of instruction and devotion, at the cathedral church or possibly other large diocesan centres. By this means, and by charging a special member of the Capitular Body with the duty of superintending pastoral work and sacred study in the Diocese, the former relations of the Cathedral with Ordination and Theological instruction may be revived. In this connexion the attention of Churchmen may be drawn to the lectures and yearly gatherings which have been initiated at the Universities and elsewhere for the help of clergymen of the Anglican Church; and the Central Society of Sacred Study, which has lately been organised for helping the Clergy in their theological reading, may also be commended to notice. It would be well if a branch of this society were established in every Diocese.

7. While placing first considerations which bear on the maintenance of a high intellectual and spiritual level in the priesthood as the surest means of attracting men towards it, your Committee are fully sensible of the importance of the financial aspect of the whole question. No one ever made the heavenly side of the Christian Ministry more prominent than did S. Paul; but no one insisted on its claim for pecuniary support more emphatically. Marriages, too often improvident, increase the difficulty; but, quite apart from this consideration, the straitness of the financial condition is grievous. The endowments of the past must be regarded not as excuses for neglect of present duties but as incentives to the discharge of them. The laity will be the first to appreciate the reasonableness of the point of view which considers whether a profession offers an adequate sphere in life before it is chosen; they demand a high standard of efficiency in the clergy, but they have no moral claim to make the demand, unless they provide the means of supplying it. No one should be admitted to Holy Orders without having received in one form or other the training mentioned in this Report; and an appeal must be made to the Church at large for the financial supplies that will place it within the reach of Candidates, and also for such an increase of funds as will secure an adequate maintenance after Holy Orders have been received.

8. It is evident, however, that no increase in the supply of Ordained Ministers will by itself keep pace with the ever increasing demands for religious agencies, resulting from the growth of population, and from the felt need of fuller spiritual services. To the above suggestions your Committee would, therefore, add a strong recommendation in favour of a larger development of the supplemental ministries of the Church. They are a formal representation of the priesthood of the laity, and an expression both of primitive practice and of present need. With reference to this subject your Committee desire to refer to the Report on Lay Evangelists (303) issued by their Lordships of the Upper House, in January 1897, together with the Resolutions on the Report, as amended by the Lower House, in May 1897, and accepted by their Lordships in February, 1898. The trained Lay Evangelist referred to in that Report holds a certificate that he has received at least one year's training in a Home sanctioned by the Bishop of the Diocese, together with a certificate of proficiency in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and of the doctrine and practice of the Church as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, and testimonials as to his moral character and qualifications for his office. In order that he may exercise his office in any given Diocese it is necessary that the Bishop should grant him a licence as a "Reader." This licence may, according to the terms of a resolution attached to a Report on Readers, drawn up by a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Convocation in 1884, include permission to conduct supplemental services in consecrated buildings, as well as permission to minister in unconsecrated places, and generally to act under the Incumbent in visiting the sick, and in the discharge of other duties. The exercise of supplemental ministries cannot be limited to those who have received special training as Lay Evangelists, and your Committee are of opinion that the deficiencies in training might be supplied, and a sense of corporate fellowship deepened, if associations of lay helpers were formed in every Diocese, and the members were periodically brought together at the cathedral or elsewhere for purposes of devotion and instruction. Fuller developments of such Diocesan action would naturally follow.

9. The work sketched out in the above recommendations is vital to the interests of the Church, but it is evident that it will involve a large amount of varied effort, with which the already overtaxed energies of Church authorities cannot be asked to cope unaided. It would be facilitated by the formation of a central Council of reference, or advisory Committee, which should in some sense be representative of the collective action of the Church in the matter. It would not be the province of such a body in any way to interfere with existing institutions or diocesan responsibility, but it would be useful for many, if not all, of the following purposes :

- (1) to watch the supply of Candidates for Holy Orders, and its sources;
- (2) to obtain financial support for the various forms of educational machinery needed for the general and special training of Candidates for Holy Orders;
- (3) to make suggestions from time to time in regard to teaching and subjects of teaching having reference to Holy Orders;
- (4) to endeavour in some degree to co-ordinate and unify examinations for Holy Orders;
- (5) to advise as to the formation and supply of new Theological Colleges, if needed, for specific purposes;
- (6) generally, to promote unity of action between University Professors and Diocesan Authorities concerned with the training of Candidates for Holy Orders, and to be ready to collect information and make suggestions at the desire of their lordships, the Bishops.

Your Committee propose that it be constructed on some such lines as these :—

(a) Representatives of the Upper Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York in equal number	6
(b) Representatives of the Lower Houses	6
(c) Representatives of the Houses of Laymen	4
(d) Representatives of the Universities of Oxford (2), Cambridge (2), Durham (1), chosen by the Theological faculty	5
(e) Representatives of Theological Colleges, including Missionary Colleges, chosen by the Principals	6
(f) Representatives of Examining Chaplains elected by Examining Chaplains or nominated by the Diocesan Bishops	6
(g) Persons nominated by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York	6
	<hr/>
	39

E. G. SANDFORD,

Chairman.

May 7, 1900.

RESOLUTIONS AGREED TO BY THE LOWER HOUSE,
9TH MAY, 1900.

1. That their Lordships the Bishops be respectfully invited to commend to the attention of Churchmen the duty of providing an adequate supply of Ministers, and to press upon the Parochial Clergy the importance both of bringing the subject prominently before their people, specially at the Ember Seasons, and also of seeking out suitable candidates for Holy Orders, with a view to encourage and direct them as to their preparation.
2. That further steps be taken to impress upon the boys of our public and other schools the importance of a sense of vocation in life, and from time to time to bring before them the subject of the special vocation of Holy Orders.
3. That in any settlement of secondary education, it is essential for the Church to provide that there shall be an adequate supply of schools where there shall be security that the tone and teaching will be generally favourable to the future choice of Holy Orders as a vocation by a fair proportion of pupils, and that special efforts be made to impart a more thorough and accurate knowledge of the Holy Scriptures than at present exists.
4. That this House hears with much interest of the efforts that are being made at the Universities to help and influence those young men who are already seeking Holy Orders, and will gratefully appreciate any further steps taken by College

Authorities and Divinity Professors in that direction, as well as any attempts made by them to promote the desire of taking Holy Orders, including occasional sermons in the College Chapels and the University Church.

5. That in the opinion of this House, the ordinary University course provides the best general educational preparation for Holy Orders, but that additional facilities should be afforded, by the establishment of hostels and exhibitions, for Candidates to receive theological teaching and pastoral training at the Universities.
6. That this House expresses a hope that under due regulations the system of training graduate Candidates for Holy Orders in the homes or under the supervision of carefully selected parochial clergymen may be extended, and that such training may be recognised by their Lordships the Bishops as an equivalent for residence at a Theological College; and that this House is of opinion that the same system might in some cases with advantage be employed for those already admitted to the Diaconate.
7. That this House cordially acknowledges the great advantages which Candidates for Holy Orders derive, both from the special training and also from the spiritual atmosphere of Theological Colleges; while at the same time it affirms the importance of maintaining Episcopal direction over these Colleges, and of keeping them in close personal relations with the Bishops of the Dioceses in which they are situated.
8. That while this House recognises the need of improved technical training for the Clergy, it is yet more deeply impressed with the importance of still further raising their spiritual level, and respectfully urges this point upon the Bishops of the Church with reference to the acceptance of Candidates for Holy Orders.
9. That it is expedient that Diocesan organisation wherever practicable should be established with a view to providing for some help and instruction for Deacons in preparation for the Priesthood and the promotion of study and the

maintenance of a high standard of life amongst those who have been ordained, and that the attention of the Parochial Clergy be drawn to the duty which they owe to their Assistant Curates in respect of opportunities for reading, especially in the early years of their ministry.

10. That in order to meet the increasing demand for spiritual agencies, it is advisable to extend, under careful regulations, the supplemental ministries of the Church, whether by reviving or adapting some of the minor Orders, or by still further organising various forms of lay help; and that your Committee desire to call attention to the Resolutions already arrived at in Convocation with regard to Lay Readers and Lay Evangelists.
11. That it is requisite that such special training as can be obtained under one or other of the foregoing proposals be as far as possible secured for all Candidates for Holy Orders, and that an urgent appeal be therefore made to Churchmen for such financial support as will provide it; and that, having regard to the fact that the endowments of the Church are unequal to meet present needs, the Laity be urged to increased exertions in discharging their responsibilities as to the provision of such additional clerical ministries as are required by the increase of population and the growing demand of larger service from the clergy.
12. That, subject to the approval of their Lordships of the Upper House, this House is of opinion that a Central Council of Reference or advisory Committee might with advantage be formed, to act under the direction of the Bishops, for such purposes and on some such lines as are laid down in the last paragraph of this Report.
13. That the Prolocutor be requested to take the above Resolutions to their Lordships of the Upper House and respectfully ask for their consideration.

Training for Ordination

BY
HERBERT KELLY
DIRECTOR, S.S.M.



(Printed for private circulation)



The S.S.M. Press
MILDENHALL, SUFFOLK
—
MCM I

PREFATORIAL.

It was about 1887 that I first began to consider how it would be possible to construct a system which should (*a*) provide a ministry adequate to the Church's claims, (*b*) by checking the terrible waste of vocation amongst the un-monied classes. In 1890, after giving the idea up very reluctantly, I was ordered to put it in operation.

Anxious to secure the highest devotion, we imposed certain Conditions of entrance, and finally offered a form of the Religious Life to such as chose to accept it. It was never, and it is not now, our intention to work solely for the Religious Life, and although in practice almost everyone does join the Society, there is no compulsion and there are some who do not join.

The House has been from the commencement an experiment. Under episcopal authority and over-sight we have been left free to test and vary our methods according to the teaching of experience. I cannot adequately express my gratitude for the confidence, patience and support of the authorities and of others who have assisted us financially. I can only try to make the House worthy of it. We have suffered great losses, discouragements, failures and disappointments, and made many terrible blunders; there have been successes, and above all the success of being able to go on.

It has been my hope that as soon as the practicability of the system was proved, the Church would take it up on a large scale and with adequate resources. Very good friends have, however, objected that our Conditions, while excellent for the Religious Life, were too exacting for that wide-sweeping use which I had in mind. I cannot say that I am personally absolutely convinced of the wisdom of this view, although I have come to think it very probable, and perhaps inevitable. Anyhow in view of the present condition and needs of the Church, the adoption of some scheme which can be worked on a large scale is vitally necessary. I cannot now change our own system which at least has advantages of its own, especially for experimental purposes. A system with less drastic conditions certainly ought to be tried. It will have great difficulties of its own to contend with, especially in regard to selection, but no one will rejoice more than I should to see it succeed.

I have been asked by a friend, who especially urged this view on me, to suggest the lines on which such a system should move, and I have thrown together here some hints, partly deductions from principles, partly the results of experience.

I must say one word of explanation. The paper has been written very hurriedly. If I discussed each point as it deserves, I must have written a volume. I should have liked to do it, but for the certainty that no one would read it. I have been forced therefore to put my points in an axiomatic form with merely hints of reasons.

Some of these points are mere common-places, on some opinion is divided, and on some I may stand alone. I am afraid of seeming opinionative and dogmatic, but I can only say in preface that I wish to do no more than give my opinion for what it is worth, and am quite conscious that that may be much less than I choose to think.

There are many things which it is very difficult to say in print without hurting the feelings or modesty of individuals. I shall be very glad to let anyone who feels interested see what is being done at the House, or to give any further information.

HERBERT KELLY,
Director, S.S.M.

MILDENHALL,
SUFFOLK.

Sept. 1901.



TRAINING FOR ORDINATION

I.—A NEW SYSTEM.

1. *Necessity.*

1. If we claim to be the Church of the whole nation we must be organising a ministry capable of the charge of, and the duties and responsibilities of the nation as a whole, not merely of that part which calls itself Church.
2. Since 1886, we have a deficit of now 164 or 20 p. c. per annum.
3. A class ministry means a class church.
4. Class vocation in any profession means class before vocation. (Cf. army).
5. A system which practically requires a pecuniary qualification is a system practically simoniacal.

2. *Conditions of the Problem.*

There are three classes of men possible :

- (a). Those with ample means ;
- (b). Those with limited means ;
- (c). Those without means.

The first need no help ; the second are largely provided for by scholarships ; the third is a very numerous class for whom nothing is done except in exceptional and sporadic cases. They are not reached by cheap colleges, and they are shut out from scholarships by the severity of competition.

3. *The method of acceptance.*

The present system consists of a relatively cheap college backed by societies for financial aid.

Objections :—

1. Grants-in-aid are very useful for those of limited means ; but for those without means the system is insufficient, uncertain and humiliating, involving the success of repeated applications for further aid.
2. It creates a diversity of interest between those who are finding the money, and those who are giving the education. Education is impossible when the student is in constant anxiety to get it over as quickly as possible.

3. The men who are experienced in dealing with students are those who ought to select.
4. The college has no control over personal expenditure.

4. *Proposals.*

1. Let the college receive all funds.
2. Let it select its own men.
3. Provide entirely for every man accepted, which will
 - (a) remove all anxiety from the student ;
 - (b) enable it to secure rigid economy.

NOTE.—I very much question if we are justified in maintaining the present distinction between missionary and theological colleges. Many men go to the former because they are much cheaper (about one-half to two-thirds) and students receive more financial assistance.

II.—TRAINING OF CHARACTER.

With many virtues the great defect of the class under consideration is self-consciousness. Beginning in shyness, this easily develops into touchiness, self-assertion, conceit, and, under the circumstances to which English clerical life is peculiarly subject, into a morbid ambition and anxiety about social position. The whole thing is fatal to influence. Self-consciousness cannot be overcome, it can only be grown out of under the influence (1) of a sound and healthy common life, (2) of true mental culture.

The following suggestions refer to the first of these points :

1. The healthy training of character depends on the tone among the men themselves.
2. To create a healthy, loving and manly tone, which is one of the most difficult as it is the most necessary of all things, the "college" idea must give way to that of the family.
3. It seems to me quite necessary that colleges should be removed into the country. No healthy tone can be created as long as men are subject to the criticism of their friends, about which they are morbidly sensitive. True and independent manliness is reached when "why not?" takes the place of "why should I?" In the Navy, ships on the home stations are notoriously slack in discipline, uncomfortable and "grousy," because of the large amount of shore-going leave which has to be acquiesced in.
4. For the same reason, the holidays should be short, suited for the men rather than the staff. A

working-man's home is not convenient for a "Long Vacation." Four weeks are ample.

5. The House ought to be poor. Let the men do the whole servants' work, except cooking, and manage it themselves.
 - (a). From the necessities of the case. The men who ought to be helped are very numerous and the funds very short. They ought to take a pride in not spending more than can be possibly helped.
 - (b). For the sake of a proper manly feeling. The craving for the gentility and appearances due to one's position—at least a maid-of-all-work—is, however universal, a radically vicious social disease. If the Church preaches against the tailor-made idea of a gentleman, she ought not to acquiesce in the servant-girl gentleman. If the Church wants gentlemen, she wants real gentlemen, not men who are afraid to black their own boots. *The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto.* (Cf. S. John xiii. 1-17). *If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them.*
6. The fewer things are left voluntary the better, and the happier the House will be. Manliness lies in the glad energy thrown into accepted duty. Discontent, weariness, and amateurishness are bred in the constant effort of voluntary and indifferent choice. At the same time rules must be reasonable, with an obvious relation to smartness, and not irritating or childish. The freedom of the university presupposes the discipline of the public school before, and the rigidity of business duty after. Clerical life provides very little of this compulsion, especially in the country. Men must learn first the habit of doing things because they have *got* to be done; next, the joy of incessant labour.
7. A rule of silence at most meals and for a substantial part of the day is almost a necessity of good feeling. Undergraduates talk athletic 'shop'; officers' messes horse-racing; students about themselves,—and all are equally bored.
8. The staff ought—unless in very exceptional cases—to be unmarried. Young men of this kind are not influenced by 'dons'; they demand the whole care of men who will live with them, and wholly for them, and as they do. In no other way can a right tone be created.

The true ultimate test of the life is happiness, as Ruskin says, "all great art is happy." A discipline the men hate, will be thrown off with relief. Discipline which they have made themselves, which they have understood, loved and delighted becomes a permanent possession. With us the staff keep the same rules as the men and take their regular turns in all house-duties. The head of a 'department' is always a student and the priest serves under him with the others. There has never been any case of bad results or want of respect ensuing; very much the opposite. It is all looked upon as excellent fun, and carried out in the best of spirits.

III.—EDUCATION.

The College must remember that its business is to provide a thorough mental education, not a technical professional knowledge.

1. For its own sake. Piety and devotion in the worker, unless stayed and guided by the habit of scientific intellectual insight, is soon reduced to aimless iteration and violent hammering in a frontal attack on a position never understood.
2. For the man himself. The very fatal disease of self-consciousness, referred to above, is largely due to mental narrowness. If the education be thorough and adequate it would almost suffice in itself.
3. Intellectual training and habit is the best means of developing a well disciplined individualism which is as vital as undisciplined individualism is disastrous.

1. *The Place.*

In theory the proper place of education is an open University. Science is one whole, and its subject matter the Will of God in variety of manifestation. Theology rightly understood, therefore is its harmony. *Voluntas Dei in rebus revelata, physica; in factis, historia; in Se Ipso, theologia.* It is vital that the priest should so understand life, but if theology be treated by itself it is hard to resist the tendency to make it a technical study.

On the other hand, Universities imply towns, and to the objections which are given above, it must be added that most such towns are unsuited to a strenuous life for the young continued through ten months in the year.

It is a very grave question whether the intensely free and somewhat self-indulgent atmosphere of the older universities (however good for men brought up in public schools)

is at all suitable for men of this class at least until a sufficiently strong tone has been created. Personally I should prefer the newer universities, but most of these do not provide theological faculties.

I am inclined to think that University hostels are the only ultimately satisfactory solution; Theological Colleges the only presently satisfactory. (See, however, below, on "Picked Cases.")

2. *Methods of Study.*

It is generally considered that education should be given through secular studies, *i.e.*, arts.

Objections :—

1. Unless an indefinite amount of time is available, outside studies cannot be carried far enough to be really satisfactory.
2. A man reasons, where a boy learns. A certain amount of the discipline of drudgery may be necessary and is in any case inevitable at starting, but if it be too prolonged it creates a distinct mental paralysis, and an exasperation at all learning as an examination requisite. Broadly speaking men do not profit by what they do not enjoy. On the other hand they soon learn to take a keen and intelligent interest in thinking out the scientific force and meaning of matters in which they are concerned. When that interest has been once aroused it not infrequently extends itself to the appreciation of other studies; it is in fact easier to awake interest in this way, *i.e.*, from theology to arts, than *vice versa*.
3. If theology is to be taught on this basis, it must be treated as a science, to be understood, reasoned out, perceived by the student himself in his own mind, not as a thing to be learnt from text-books or tutors. *That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.* The student should be warned from the first, of the uselessness of reproducing the opinions of the learned. The priest's mind should be a workshop, not a pantechicon of other people's furniture. The public-school and University man may be a pass-man, but the Theological College student should always study as for honour schools. The former gets breadth and experience in his social life, which the latter can get only from his education.

4. If young men are shown where the beasts lair and taught to hunt their own dinners, they will learn something and get an appetite. They will have to do it one day. One lecture a day is ample, and will give time for reading in scholarly books; more than that reduces everything to "getting up notes."

3. *Subjects of Study.*

The two main subjects are history and dogmatics.

1. The history must come first, because induction is more natural than deduction. Men learn abstract ideas by finding them always at the back of actions. If they are taught not to learn off heresies and decisions and names, but to understand why men did and thought such and such things, they will in a year or two *demand* philosophy. The history thus comprehends criticism and the history of mental progress as well as of political, economical and even military ideas; the last three being of even primary importance after, say, 800 A.D. The method I urge is that of Harnack's *History of Dogma*.
2. Under "dogmatics" (for want of a better name) I include the whole range of abstract conceptions, starting from metaphysics, as in the *Summa Theologica* of S. Thomas, where the writer is absorbed in what a doctrine means, and its connection and force in the whole circuit of thought. I refer to these two writers for the aim of their method only. Whether the working out or results of either are satisfactory is another matter.

4. *Practical Training.*

The beginning of all sound work is the tremendous sense of responsibility and reverence for souls. If there is any practical work for which the men are really needed, as often happens in colonial dioceses, let them do their best *in nomine Domini*. In England, however, this very commonly means visiting or preaching *for practice*, and this is detestable,—an insult to the poor, and ruinous to the men, who ought not to be allowed to think such a thing possible. The desire to run before one is sent shows a vanity which needs restraint. They ought to dread practical work, and enter on it with fear and trembling. The diaconate is the time for learning practical work. All that ought to be taught of sermon-writing can be taught in half-an-hour. It should never, *me judice*, be made a business. Teach them

to write essays, clear, exact, without rhetoric. When a man can manage his thoughts, the rhetoric comes of the depth of his passion, but it is impossible for a man to simulate true passion for the criticism of the Principal. Perhaps two sermons, quite at the close of the course, just to explain the obvious errors, would be useful. Voice production, music and intelligent reading are on the other hand of great importance, also the *Catéchisme* (Dupanloup).

IV.—THE SYSTEM IN PRACTICE.

1. *Discipline.*

1. The first thing is the creation of tone. We made little progress in the matter in six years in town, and succeeded fairly in a few months as soon as we got into the country. Starting in the latter, it might be done in a year or two, but none need be discouraged if he has to sit out two or three generations. There is only one way of doing anything—to sit at it till it is done. Suspiciousness is a very common temptation of the class, and they will not give themselves easily.
2. It is almost unnecessary to say that discipline enforced by watchfulness is useless. It must become the honour and habit of the house. This will depend ultimately on the seniors.
3. At the beginning there may be much that will be resented, and one may have to have rules which are not kept. Ultimately it is the business of an engineer to find out what pressure and speed his engines can be worked at. The feeling of the men is the best guide.

2. *Selection.*

Selection of men is a question of immense importance and complexity.

1. The beginnings of the work must, of course, be small, but no one ought to start anything without an idea in his mind of where he expects to get to. If the Church really means to appeal to all classes with an open door, there would be a new awakening of faith in her mission, and we may confidently look for hundreds of new candidates every year. (I have had about a hundred a year for the last four years).

2. Whether there be many small colleges, or one large one, acceptance ought to be made by the colleges, and together, so that men may not go about seeking from one to another.
3. If all cannot be accepted, selection must be by competition; but it should be a selection of the most promising (not merely of those who already are farthest on); and this can only be measured by the experience of the principals. Intellectual power is of course a factor, but capacity is of more importance than attainments. Character is of still higher importance, and more difficult to measure. It is best to have the men down on a visit, and simply choose by what one can judge. A candidate once came as a visitor. The next morning I saw him hard at work peeling potatoes, so I took him. The simplest, brightest, most straightforward men are those best worth having. Brightness, good spirits and a ready smile are excellent things to look for, and show an absence of self-consciousness. Testimonials are very little good commonly except against really bad or weak characters, as so much depends on the writer. An earnest parish priest will write earnestly about a good man, sometimes about a man he likes to believe is good; a luke-warm priest will write with chilling indifference about the holiest of men.
4. No doubt the best apparent test is probation, yet it is of dubious morality. To devote a man's first months to making an impression on his superiors is a very bad start. Further, it is very difficult to ask a man to give up a good position in business for an uncertain experiment.

3. *Rejection.*

1. Selection is most trying work and yet of vital importance. The primary difficulties ought to be clearly recognised, and this first:—There is a large body of men, often well-meaning and not without religious interests, who are yet keenly alive to the social elevation implied in ordination. "At last I am a gentleman," said a certain deacon on the day of his ordination;—a very desirable result no doubt, but not one on which the ordinal lays stress.
2. A few men of really low motive—often quite unconsciously so—drag down a House terribly. "Grousing" and suspicion spread like fire. Even if the House

escapes being infected throughout, it will lead to the existence of parties, and to a consequent restlessness and sense of strain which check growth like a night frost. Here it is that the presence of the staff *in* the house—as sharers of the life—is so vital. Nothing can be done under such circumstances from without.

3. The obvious remedy is expulsion, but it is a most difficult one to use. Men may be expelled for exceptional breaches of rule, but it requires a very rare fortitude and a very rare self-confidence to throw a man back on the world for no very assignable reason except “bad influence.” If however the tone of the House be well established, the seniors keen and resolute, and the discipline strict, men who are not really suited will be extruded by the pressure of the mass, yet they may do much harm first.

In any case it ought to be understood that testing and rejecting in some way or other is as necessary a part of the College’s work as training.

4. *Education.*

1. The only necessary preliminaries for acceptance in my opinion should be ability to write and spell simple English correctly. (Personally I think a candidate’s letter of application the best entrance test).
2. The preliminary studies of Latin and Greek must be carried on up to the Central Entrance. To this should be added a scientific study of Roman History, and the elements of Logic which is quite as necessary to teach correct thinking as grammar is to teach correct writing.
3. Education of one kind or another may be found in almost anything, but the higher intellectual education begins with the theology.
4. Personally I do not think a thorough education can be given them in less than four years; perhaps abler teaching might succeed with three, exclusive of the preliminaries. A medical qualification requires five years; a university degree three, but four is more common.
5. If the average man can use his Greek testament it is better not to trouble further over Greek, but let him do as much ecclesiastical Latin as possible. It is better he should have one language he can use, than two he cannot.

6. On the same principle none but the most exceptional men should do Hebrew. It pays in the examination, but no one without the special vocation of a student is ever likely to learn enough to use it. For real student's work I should put German before Hebrew.
7. It is very desirable that all men should get some familiarity with natural science, its mode of work and habit of thought.

5. *Expense.*

1. The average cost of a small house in London (4-12 men) was from £47-52 per annum a head. In the country a larger house (15-36) has cost £40-44. In this is included all expenses; *i.e.* clothing, proportion of rent, etc., furnishing, firing, food, books, stamps, fares home and back once a year, an allowance of tobacco, football, cricket and tennis necessities. Wages are included, in London for a cook, in the country for a gardener. All property *e.g.* clothing and books, is common, and therefore used to the uttermost. No pocket-money is ever given. Men who have no friends may remain up for the holidays or are sent out to friends of the house—very occasionally help is given.
2. Clothes must, of course, be tidy and well-mended, but if the tone of the House be good, the men will be happily contented and amused over the age and poverty thereof—provided only their friends do not see them so. Clothing in London is, therefore, a much more expensive item than when the House is by itself. A cassock covers a multitude of sins. Age and shabbiness matter much less in uniform than in mufti.
3. Dictionaries, grammars, and a Revised Version every man should have; Latin texts, etc., one to each man in the class using it. Of named books, to be read in course, one to every three in the class will suffice, or less if there are alternatives. Thus a class of six will want two copies of Gwatkin, but one man will work up Athanasius and another Hilary and another Robertson's *Prolegomena*. Variety of this kind is helpful.
4. In the above estimates priests and students are counted alike. In a secular College some stipend must be paid beyond maintenance, and allowance for this made accordingly.

5. Clerical pay is very small for a man in later life, but the pay at the start is very good. There is no reason why a young unmarried man who means to, and who is accustomed to simplicity, should not live on £80 or even £60 a year. I know of men who have done it, bought a few books and paid for an annuity. It would be an excellent thing that every man should agree to pay back the cost of his education before being free to marry. It would be a good training in self-restraint, and serve to shade off the discipline of the College life into the ultimately unrestricted freedom which lay beyond. This might be either by written agreement or by written understanding, and be released in case of taking foreign service or having relatives dependent.

6. Staff.

1. No doubt the greatest difficulty is likely to be that of ensuring a permanent staff. As in the army everyone wants to be in the firing line, so in the Church it is very hard to get men to leave their parishes for a service of mere preparation.
2. If the men are to live simply and poorly, the staff must not live comfortably or have good salaries. He has to teach devotion, sacrifice and indifference to the world.
3. It is a great mistake to think the work requires men of very exceptional ability, still less does it need dignified or distinguished men. A really intellectual mental habit, a love for working out the psychological and scientific reason for everything is the only necessity. The men will not mind if their teacher is only a student like themselves, provided he is a student on right lines. They want method, not attainments.
4. If he loves his men, and will play with them, chaff them, work with them, as a father and elder brother, they will teach him all he needs, provided he is always thinking and trying to learn, and to get on.

V.—ADDITIONAL POINTS.

1. *Training in a parish.*

The most difficult period is that during the preliminary study, *i.e.*, for Central Entrance. The men are new. The life of discipline, even though enjoyed is exacting, and the weary drudgery of elementary classics becomes a terrible burden.

A good deal has been said about men being trained for ordination under selected clergy whom they are to assist in their parish work. For men of mature years, taking orders late in life, I can believe the system might work very well. For young men whose characters and minds have to be formed I have no belief in it. It has been tried in the colonies. The parish clergy have rarely the power, and never the time, for so exceedingly delicate a work.

On the other hand I think it would not be at all a bad system in very many cases to put young men out in this way till they had passed the Central Entrance.

2. Boys.

1. There is another point of very great importance. If we want the *pick* of the national schools, we must take them at 16, which is the age of decision.* At this age boys in the lower and lower-middle classes go to business, and, whatever they once wanted, by 20 and over you will only get the second choice. No doubt there are many brilliant exceptions, but it seems only common-sense to say that men who want to change their professions are not as a rule the most hopeful class.
2. So far as our own experience goes, boys have been a great power. They bring with them a fresh whole-hearted enthusiasm, and they have never learnt to add up costs and profits.
3. It is a difficult question whether the boys should have an entirely separate House or live near the men. The danger to morals, and the dangers resulting from too great intimacy between those of different ages are obvious. On the other hand the boyish enthusiasm is a great help to the men and adds an element of gentle brotherliness which is wanted in a house exclusively male, while the men represent to the boys progress, steadfastness and completion. We keep the boys under a separate roof but in the same grounds, with a rule of very restricted intercourse, and this works very well. In a secular college it is much less easy to make sure of excluding undesirable men and the risks might be greater. If boys were taken at 14, of course absolute separation must be insisted upon.
4. One great advantage in taking boys is the opportunity it gives of creating a more thorough general basis for education.

*(The Romans say 14, but although my sympathies were strongly with them, my experience is all against boys under 16, although 15 is occasionally necessary).

3. *Picked Cases.*

1. Men divide themselves naturally into two classes:—
(a) those of real intellectual power and interest, and (b) those of practical interest. From the latter comes the normal type of parochial clergy who need to be taught a thoughtful habit which shall save them from unintelligent routine, and to know what scholarship is when they come across it. The principal must however expect a certain proportion of men of a very different stamp, whom he must look out for and make the most of. A telegraph messenger who had learnt a little Greek Testament, passed the Senior Locals in two years in Religious Knowledge, Roman History, Logic, Latin, Greek, French and German. He could have taken elementary Hebrew, and he is by no means alone, nor the best.
2. Any complete scheme ought to include a University Hostel for this class. The stock of available theologians in the Church is not sufficiently high to allow of any being lost who can be made really effective.

4. *Size.*

The proper size of Colleges is a very difficult question. The Council of Trent, I understand, wanted to establish Diocesan Seminaries as a normal rule, but it has never been found possible. Small Colleges are more home-like no doubt, and most Principals, I believe, do not like to go beyond 40. On the other hand large Colleges are more economical, and provide a freer exchange of intellectual life. I see no reason why a House should stop short of 100. The smaller the Houses the more often the difficulty of creating "tone" would be repeated, and the worse the results of having unsatisfactory men. I believe that each such House could easily be run on £4000 a year, of which at least half would be found by the men and by repayment, if my proposed scheme were accepted. The output of each should be about 20 men annually.

THE SOURCES AND AUTHORITY
OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY



THE
SOURCES & AUTHORITY
OF
DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

Being an Inaugural Lecture delivered by the

REV. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
AND PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1903

All rights reserved

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED,
BREAD STREET HILL, E.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

PREFACE

THE following Lecture is published substantially as it was delivered. I have altered or omitted some sentences which seemed to me incorrect, and attempted to remodel some of those most ill-expressed. I have also restored a few passages which were omitted on account of their length.

I should like, however, to take this opportunity of amplifying a few points in the argument. My friend Mr. Boutwood, of the Aristotelian Society, to whose friendly criticisms I have been much indebted, writes with reference to the use that I have made on p. 16 and elsewhere of the term "Law": "Do we gain much or anything by using 'popular language'? It is true that the 'Reign of Law' summarises to the popular mind the distinctive achievement of modern science, but the moment one asks what this means we get away from the conception of Law as the plain man understands it, and as you, in condescension to his weakness, make use of it. He thinks of Law as something regulative and imposed *ab extra*. But science has, I think, definitely made this conception impossible. It

finds and knows no separate or separable laws—only matter and energy in indissoluble connection. The world as science represents it is not made up out of matter governed by law, but by energetic matter, which acts, not by direction from without, but by the energies of its own nature.” And he would ask the same question as I do in the following form: “Is this world of dynamic reality self-existent, and can we explain from it human nature?”

I need not say that with the substance of this criticism I entirely concur. Laws of Nature are not laws in the sense of direction from without, but, as is stated in the lecture, only observed uniformities. But there is no other expression yet produced which will adequately express the idea science wishes to convey, and I find it used by every scientific writer whose books or articles I have read. I should not be clear to most of my hearers if I did not use the word. Nor, so far as I am aware, is there any point in my argument which depends upon reading into the word Law associations which are not legitimate. It is quite true that all that science knows as yet is that the same things happen in the same circumstances. But how have things come to be such that by the same things happening in the same circumstances a universe has come into being which appears to a mind that is rational to be itself rational?

It used to be held that the proper way to reconcile science and theology was to divide their spheres—God made certain things, and Nature did the rest. This

was a conception which adequately satisfied both the theology and the science of the eighteenth century ; but science informs us that this is now an impossible theory, and, in doing so, is only re-echoing an older and better theology.

This is how Sir Oliver Lodge writes :

“Is it, then, so simple? Does the uniformity and the eternity and the self-sustainedness of it make it the easier to understand? Are we so sure that the guidance and control are not really continuous, instead of being, as we expected, intermittent? May we not be looking at the working of the Manager all the time and at nothing else? Why should He step down and interfere with Himself? That is the lesson science has to teach theology—to look for the action of the Deity, if at all, then always ; not in the past alone, nor only in the future, but equally in the present. If His action is not visible now, it never will be, and never has been visible.”¹

I must take exception to the words “science has to teach theology.” I should rather put it, “science may learn from theology.” At any rate such a doctrine was taught by Thomas Aquinas many hundreds of years before science thought of it. In the *Summa contra Gentiles de Unitate Catholicae Fidei*, III. lxxvii—lxx., he argues, first, that all things work through the power of God, *omne igitur operans operatur per virtutem Dei*. But

¹ *The Reconciliation between Science and Faith*. By Sir Oliver Lodge, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S. *The Hibbert Journal*, I., 2, p. 214.

this does not take away their proper action from created things, *non igitur auferimus proprias actiones rebus creatis, quamvis omnes effectus rerum creatarum Deo attribuamus quasi in omnibus operanti*. For it is not that things are done partly by natural, partly by Divine causes. In every action both causes are complete. *Patet etiam quod non sic idem effectus causae naturali et divinae virtuti attribuitur quasi partim a Deo, partim a naturali agente fiet, sed totus ab utroque secundum alium modum sicut idem effectus totus attribuitur instrumento et principali agenti etiam totus*. No doubt the science of the schoolman would seem strangely expressed nowadays ; but for theology to claim that God is everywhere and is always Himself working in and through natural causes is not a novel doctrine, made to meet an apologetic need, but has always been part of her teaching.

There is one more point on which a few words of explanation are necessary. There is no word that puzzles and frightens a certain number of persons so much as "authority." When Mr. Balfour introduced it into his work on the *Foundations of Belief*, his critics were up in arms and began to scent ecclesiasticism. As a matter of fact he was quite right in recognising that all beliefs, whether of science, of morals, or of faith, must rest ultimately on some authority. In the following pages 'authority' is always used, not of what is antagonistic to reason, but of what commends itself to reason. Scientific beliefs have authority in so far as we are satisfied with the processes by

which they are attained. So with regard to religion, we look from what source we attain our knowledge of Divine things, and what is the authority on which we believe them. That authority is for most Christians—Protestant or Catholic—the living voice of their Church; from this they receive a system of doctrine and life and the Bible, which contains the credentials of their Church. So long as doubt, or enquiry, or comparison are absent; so long as the teaching they have accepted corresponds to their spiritual and intellectual nature, they do not doubt the authority. But a time for enquiry may come. It is the purpose of this Lecture to sketch the lines of such an enquiry, and to suggest the rational grounds on which and the limits within which we may accept the authority of Scripture, Tradition, and the Church as giving us knowledge of Divine things. Only let it be clearly understood that there can be no authority which does not commend itself to our reason and work in us through our reason.

But if I should continue further I should far exceed the limits of a Preface.

THE SOURCES AND AUTHORITY OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

I

ANY one who at the present day is appointed a professor of Dogmatic Theology will find himself confronted with a task which has within recent years immensely increased in difficulty. To a very large number of persons the branch of knowledge which he professes appears to be something quite useless and unreal. Its name has an offensive ring; it deals with a subject matter which is held to have no existence except in words, and to have no relation to the actual realities of life; and the sources of this supposed knowledge are held to be destitute of any claims to authority.

It is difficult to estimate how far in popular conception a prejudice may be created by a name. No doubt theologians have often been improperly dogmatic in defence of incorrect opinions, just as many men of science were very improperly dogmatic against the dogma of evolution. The only popular use of the word "dogmatic" is as an epithet condemning a certain habit of mind, and to many persons the phrase "dog-

matic theology" comes inevitably with a number of associations which are quite adventitious. A science professor who discusses the principles of science would be looked upon with suspicion if his subject were called dogmatic science, and if a professor of dogmatic theology were said to lecture on the "truths" or "principles" of theology, a good deal of quite uncalled for opposition would be disarmed. Yet, as it is needless for me to remind you, this would be a perfectly correct description of his work. His business is to investigate, to expound, and to systematise those truths about God and human destiny, whether derived from nature or revelation, which should be believed. A dogma means a truth to be believed, and is just as much applicable to the truths of science as of theology.

But it will be argued at once—Science deals with realities, Theology deals only with a system of words and ideas. It is concerned with a number of controversies about things which have no relation at all to human life. Such an attitude may have been partially justified from an inadequate representation of theology, or from that want of perspective which comes from confusing the words and formulas on which controversy has turned with the fundamental truths which are really its subject matter. A very little consideration will show that, although it may be true that many controversies have been unnecessary, and that an excessive love of definitions seems sometimes to have obscured the main issue, yet a theology which is undogmatic is impossible. It may be quite right that our beliefs should be simpler

and less well-defined than were those of the schoolmen, but even the most rudimentary discussion on religious or moral topics implies a dogmatic belief. We may banish the Apostles' Creed, but the first two words of the Lord's Prayer are meaningless unless we have a theology. We cannot in any real sense use these words unless we believe in the existence of God, and in that relationship between Him and mankind, which is generally expressed theologically by the phrase "The Fatherhood of God." But in these two propositions we have all the elements of a very wide and far-reaching theology.

The subject-matter of theology includes the existence and nature of God ; the source and extent of man's knowledge of God ; the relation of man to God ; the relation of God to man ; the aim and destiny of human life. It is obvious that the answers to questions on subjects such as these are, and must be, of tremendous importance for men. All human life and conduct turns on them. It is necessary here, as much as elsewhere, to have careful and exact thinking, and so long as language continues to be the vehicle for the expression of human thought to have accurate language for the expression of thought.

It is quite true that there have been periods when dogmatic theology has got into a narrow groove and has been divorced from the realities of human life, but the same can be said of philosophy, of science, of literature, and of classical scholarship. That, however, is no reason for supposing that shallow thought and slovenly expression can be a substitute for trained thinking. A

14 THE SOURCES AND AUTHORITY OF

steam engine can never be constructed by popular science, although science may be quite capable of popular expression; and the life and conduct of a nation can never be regulated by inexact thinking, although a preacher must be able to expound the teaching he is attempting to realise in language that his hearers can understand.

I do not believe that any thoughtful person, who is prepared in any way to admit the claims of religion, will really think that dogmatic theology is unnecessary. Religion is the most powerful force in the elevation of human life, and it must be of the greatest importance that the religious beliefs should be healthy and true. But a second objection is not that theology is useless, but that however useful it may be it is untrue; that the sources from which it is derived are destitute of authority. A theologian in older days found a comparatively straightforward and simple task before him. He had certain documents, the Old Testament, the New Testament, and if he were a high churchman the Fathers, and he might use them very much in the way that a lawyer uses his cases. He could build up his theology by citing authorities. Difficulty and controversy might and did arise as to the exact limits of the authority and the interpretation of its meaning, but the authority and sources of his teaching were invariably accepted. But a theologian nowadays, if he is to win at all a wide acceptance for his conclusions, must begin by a very careful examination of his sources. He will no longer

find anything taken for granted. There was controversy between Romanist, Protestant, and Anglican as to the exact authority of the Fathers, but all alike would agree on the authority of Scripture. Now it is just that authority which is not only attacked by outsiders, but doubted largely by theologians themselves. The real question (often concealed by subsidiary controversies) is what ground have we for believing that the system of belief based upon the Bible is true? In what sense can we rely upon it as the main source of our knowledge of divine things?

As an introduction to a course of lectures on dogmatic theology, a review becomes necessary of the results of human thought and knowledge, so far as they affect our religious beliefs. It is claimed that changes have been produced by the discoveries of science, by the criticism of philosophy, by the application of historical methods to the study of the Old and New Testaments and by the altered view which recent investigation gives us of the growth and development of the theology of the Church. It is these questions that I propose to consider, unfortunately very cursorily, to-day.

II

What is the influence of the discoveries of Natural Science on Religious Belief? Some persons would tell us that, if we only knew it, science has made religion in any real sense of the word impossible. It has evolved a new theory of the universe in which there is no room

for a divine being, it has completely changed our ideas of human motive, and will shortly formulate, if it has not done so already, a new standard of conduct. I need not say that I do not believe this. To my mind, the discoveries of science not only do not, but cannot, touch the fundamental truths of religion ; they deal with quite a different sphere of things. So far as they have changed our view of the world it is to substitute a really religious view for the old half mythological conceptions, while for the control of conduct religious principles are as necessary as they ever have been.

Science, as I understand it, in distinction from metaphysics, starts with taking the world as it is. It assumes within its own sphere the validity of our human intelligence, and the reality of the external world as a practical hypothesis, and it is quite content with the verification of its results which experience gives. It deals with the world of which we have knowledge directly or indirectly through the senses ; it assumes that (for its purpose) that knowledge, although limited, is adequate. It investigates the character of this world of which we have cognisance by our senses and applies, often very successfully, the result of its investigations to the amelioration of human life. Now, working on this basis, what has it achieved ?

Using popular language, and recognising the limitations of that language, we may say that science has taught us the Reign of Law in the universe, that the whole visible universe has grown to be what it is by the working and development of what are in themselves singularly simple laws or ascertained uniformities ; and that while the greater our knowledge of the universe the

more wonderful its complexity appears, the greater the advance of science the simpler do we find the laws of its working. The difference between the old conception and the new might be shown by one instance. According to the former, every individual species in the animal and vegetable kingdom could only be accounted for by a special creation, a special manifestation of divine power. Modern science, by the powers of the microscope, has revealed to us organic nature as something infinitely more complex than anything we had ever conceived, but at the same time it tells us that all this infinite complexity has been developed, by the action of quite simple laws and by processes which are continually being better understood, from the individual organic cell of an amœba-like animal. There is no room for any special creation. There are gaps in our knowledge still to fill up, gaps which may never be filled up, but scientific imagination, passing it is true out of the region of proved conclusions, has clearly conceived the possibility of reducing all our knowledge of nature to one single principle. It assumes the development of the whole solar system from some primeval vapour, the development of life from the chemical combination of physical substances, the development of man from the lower animals. It would maintain that the chain of development is continuous, and that there is probably no room anywhere for any special manifestation of creative power. Somehow or other life has come out of matter and mind out of life in ways which we may not be able to understand, but which are for all that simply natural processes.

But if we ask the origin or the cause of the universe, to that science can give no answer. All such problems are, so far as it is concerned, just as much unsolved as ever. It shows us a wonderful process continuously working, but the origin of that process remains unknown. The old question remains but has to be asked differently. We no longer ask, what intelligence was sufficient to make the world as it is, but what intelligence was sufficient to initiate and inspire a universe which could come to be what it is. In all these discoveries there is nothing which militates against the belief in a God, a divine intelligence, as Creator. It is just as true as ever it was to say that our mind cannot conceive the existence of the universe without a cause for its existence; it cannot conceive the existence of what bears so strongly the marks of being rational without believing it the creation of intelligence; it cannot conceive the existence of mind without a Cause which is infinitely more rational than the Reason which has sprung from its creation. To me the more wonderful Nature is shown to be, the more infinitely complex in its manifestations, the more simple in its laws, so much the more does it lead me back to the necessary belief in a Creator, a Divine Reason, who through the countless ages has been working in and through the laws by which He is making the universe, whose divine power has been shown, not in the breaches of a physical law, which is looked upon as something outside Himself, but in the working of the Law which is His creature, His servant, the manifestation of His Being. Metaphysics may still be able to criticise, as it

has criticised in the past, the validity of this argument, but science cannot, for it is beyond the limits of science; and scientific research has not made it less but more cogent, for it has revealed a manifestation of divine power far more worthy of its divine origin than any which the human mind had hitherto conceived.

I am not of course prepared to assert either that life is but a higher manifestation of force, or that the human mind has been evolved directly out of life. What I do feel is that the utmost possible development of science in this direction is not anything to be conceded grudgingly, that a basis for Christian apologetics ought not to be found in the present limitations of science, for its present limitations are often its future triumphs. The more science can discover, the greater will become the need of the divine Creator to be the source and guide of the universe, not the less. Nor, again, does it seem to me that there is any reason to limit the manifestation of divine power to organic life. We may know perfectly and accurately the laws in accordance with which a crystal is formed, and may understand completely its molecular construction, but that should not blind us to the fact that the wonderful thing is that there should be laws (or whatever we call them) by which the crystal is produced. The thought of this demands an adequate explanation as much as the complicated structure of the human eye, and the adequate explanation must be one which recognises the element of reason.

Such a conception of Nature as we have had in our mind does not banish the idea of a God working in and

through the universe any more than it banishes the idea of God as a Creator. Although there is a physical cause for every phenomenon, and because that cause is a general law, the whole infinitely complicated scheme of the universe may equally in every detail and in the whole scheme represent the workings of an infinite intelligence.

The controller of a complicated piece of machinery always works by mechanical laws, but any movement of that machinery is the direct result of a controlling mind, which attains its aim, not by interfering with but by using the mechanical appliances, and so the whole universe may quite well be looked upon on one side as simply the outcome of the working of certain well-known laws (as we call them), but regarded from the other, be simply the manifestation of an infinite intelligence. Whether this be so or not may demand further proof, is, in fact, in itself incapable of proof ; what I am at present concerned to maintain is that no discovery which science has yet made, and no discovery which it is conceivable that it could make, in any way interferes with such a conception. The religious aspect of the universe is not something antagonistic to the scientific aspect, but something quite consistent with it. It does not require a different set of facts but is merely a different way of looking at the same facts.

I think that I am justified in quoting, as agreeing with what has been said so far (although probably he would not accept all that I have to say), some words of one of our scientific professors :—

“When we know,” he writes, “that the protoplasmic folk who spin, though lacking wheels, and weave though

wanting looms, without intercommunication or moving from the place where each is chained—when I understand that each lays down his microscopical length of thread in the precise manner needed and designed by the idea of the whole, formulated by the will of the Law governing the life of each working cell, we are silent in deep worship of this eternal, ever revealing Law, in whose service we men and women are also enlisted. We hardly then dare exclaim, ‘How beautiful!’ but fall silently on our knees as if in tacit prayer to the Unknown for some closer touch with its infinite life.”¹

There are other aspects of the relation of science and theology which might be discussed. All that I wish at this point to contend is that scientific discovery cannot interfere with the realm of theology. So far as theology is concerned science is absolutely free; and so far as science is concerned theology may pursue its own way. Science can produce no valid argument against the existence of a God, nor do the further discoveries of science alter in any real way the position of the question. At the same time it is true that scientific investigation has made it very hard for many men of science to believe. A friend of mine of considerable scientific attainments once said to me, “I do not believe that science proves anything contrary to the truth of religion, or, indeed, of Christianity; but it is true that the study of science makes it very difficult indeed for most of us to believe.” These words, I think, express exactly

¹ *The Religious Sense in its Scientific Aspect.* By Greville Macdonald, M.D., p. 104.

the truth. Just as to the mediæval hagiologist who compiled the Golden Legend the belief in scientific method and scientific law would have been impossible, for his mind was so filled with a different aspect of the world which he would have thought that experience had verified for him, that there was no room in it for new truths ; so many a man at the present day is so completely absorbed with all his intellectual powers in investigating the laws of nature, that for him there is no room for anything else. But truth is not limited by the calibre of a man's brain ; and just as science is true in spite of the disbelief of a mediæval or modern hagiologist, so religion may be true even though the religious sense may be atrophied by a one-sided attention to the investigation of the natural causes of things.

And what is true of some individual man of science is equally true of the intellectual tendency of the day. It is sometimes said that this is a Positive Age. Our attention is directed often in what is clearly a disproportionate degree towards what is purely material. Our whole mind becomes absorbed in certain aspects of truth, and finds it difficult to care for, or grasp, or realise any other. So in the case of many people nowadays, their whole interest is devoted to the discoveries of science, or the application of scientific knowledge to the amelioration of the conditions of human life, and they do not care for the more spiritual aspect of the world or for spiritual truths, which are not in the least inconsistent with their ruling conceptions. But this banishment of the spiritual does not depend upon, and is not justified by, any logical method. The exces-

sive pursuit of pleasure deadens our minds to moral truths ; but the moral truths are true all the same. A one-sided pursuit of science may deaden our minds to religious truths ; but religion may still be true, still necessary for human life, and the investigation of its truths and principles just as important as it ever has been.

III

I do not propose to say much about the relation of theology to the various branches of mental and moral philosophy, both because in many directions there is little new—philosophy still gives the strongest arguments for religious belief and suggests the most real difficulties—and because metaphysics themselves, equally with theology, exist only on sufferance in the opinion of many thinkers. Philosophy at present, to one who is not a philosopher, seems to speak with rather an uncertain sound. If the older sensationalism has made way for idealism, idealism is giving way in many minds to some form of realism, while coincidentally scientific methods are laying their hands on psychology, claiming to wrest it from metaphysics, and suggesting that here, too, science will solve the problems which have defeated the less exact methods of the past. It is only possible therefore to touch on two or three leading points.

A new, or apparently new, departure meets us in experimental psychology. Its value and capabilities it is difficult at present to appraise. To the physician and

to medical science it will, it seems to me, be of the greatest value in the future ; to education it may be of service if it is combined with the saving common-sense so often absent from educational theorists. But no doubt its advocates claim more for it than this. I do not believe myself that it touches, or can touch, the fundamental problems of life. We have always known that when we worked our brain our feet had a tendency to become cold, and that any violent emotion had definite physical effects. If these physical results of mental action can be worked out quantitatively there will be a definite gain to science. We know, indeed, that mind influences body and body mind. We have always recognised that our intellectual equipment is dependent on a physical basis. But the problem of how the physical changes in brain-stuff are translated into the facts of mental consciousness is not any nearer solution than it was before, however accurately we may measure mental phenomena. The mechanism of the brain does not account for the intellectual life which uses it, any more than the mechanism of a motor-car accounts for the intelligence which directs it. Even if in a sense it is true that consciousness is the product of evolution, just as we know that it is evolved in each individual, the process of the acquirement does not explain the fact of existence. When God breathed first into man the breath of conscious life, as He breathes it still into each individual, it was as much His work, if He accomplished it through the energy of Nature which is His energy, as it would have been had He to interfere with that energy. Consciousness is a fact, and a

fact that requires metaphysics for its explanation, for the mystery is that that which, from one point of view, is part of the stream of existence, from another point of view is something outside of that stream, combining, creating, unifying the very world of which it is a part.

It was the great service of Professor Green to idealist philosophy that he showed, in a way which seemed to many of us conclusive, that the older sensationalism gained no real support from the fact of evolution, and that it still remains an inadequate explanation of the facts of mental and moral life. That idealist philosophy gives a perfectly adequate basis upon which a system of Christian theology may be built up, has generally, in spite of the efforts of Mr. Bradley, been recognised. It is not necessary for me to go over such well known ground. A recent exposition of such a basis for belief has been made by Dr. Rashdall in *Contentio Veritatis*. It is a lucid statement of the principles of idealism, and an able defence of Christian theology. It is not indeed entirely convincing. For it fails, from a certain element of dogmatism, and an almost excessive logical completeness which suggests a feeling of unreality. We wonder after all when we have read it whether this conception of the universe so unlike our ordinary ideas is really true.

For somehow, many of those who used to be strong idealists are not so now. They are beginning, strange as it may seem, to drift into realism. To me the argument which seems to lead in that direction is something as follows. It is quite true that all I know of the external

world is my consciousness of that world, but after all how does it come about that so many other minds share that consciousness, and express it just as I do, and that they can analyse it, as I analyse it, and that they think of it as I think of it? Does not this multiplicity of *egos*, of the existence of which my *ego* gives me information, sharing the same impression of something which they believe to be external, imply a reality in that outside world of which they have an impression? If I alone see a thing, I do not know anything about its reality. My glasses may be coloured. But have all men coloured glasses? So I begin to believe that the cause of my consciousness of what is external to me is that there is an external thing of which I have not indeed a perfect but an adequate knowledge. A realism of this sort is probably most in accordance with the spirit of the age, but realism is not materialism. We only arrive at a belief in the reality of the causes of our sensations by assuming the reality of our mind. And it is only if the mind be real that we can explain the existence of the science which would try and explain away mind. The analysis of consciousness which is at the basis of idealism remains true when idealism changes into realism, and to explain the facts of mind some hypothesis is required as much as to explain the existence of a rational universe. Just as when we were examining the facts of the universe we suggested that they might be explained by the hypothesis which theology supplies, so is it true of mind. We cannot prove the truths of theology in any way in which we can the truths of science, for science is an analysis of the experience of our senses, and religion

deals with what is beyond the cognisance of our senses ; but whether we look at the fact of a rational universe or of a mind which can have cognisance of that fact, or of the moral instincts of that mind, of all these facts the explanation given by theology is adequate. Philosophy asks certain questions and sets certain problems. Of these problems Theology gives us a solution. God, Nature, the human soul—the belief in these may still be the most rational solution of the problem of existence.

One more service philosophy renders to theology. While it quite rightly reminds us of the absence of strict logical proof of much that theology rightly puts forward as an adequate explanation, it at the same time reminds us also of the futility of much popular or semi-popular criticism. The truths or statements of theology must clearly often be beyond the real grasp of the human mind. That that is so is certainly no ground for not accepting them. The one thing certain, where so much is uncertain, is the limitation of the human mind. That we cannot understand a thing is clearly no reason why it should not be true. Our human intellect is limited by a very narrow experience. Before all that transcends that experience an attitude of reverent agnosticism, an agnosticism which may be the quite adequate basis of belief is most in accordance with the limits of our intelligence, and our consciousness of the inadequacy of our mental equipment. Religion becomes a reality because we know how much there is which we cannot understand.

IV

So far we have examined the sources of what is commonly called Natural Theology. It has not of course been possible to do so with any completeness, but we have touched on those points on which discovery has been made, or where criticism has been at work. And our conclusion is that recent discovery or speculation has not in any real way altered the problem, and that the hypothesis of a theistic solution is still the one which will most adequately account for all the facts. But if there be a God, He would not have left Himself without witness, and we proceed to examine the different sources of Revealed Religion.

We may pass for our present purpose very lightly over the Revelation of God in the universal religious instinct of the human race. The study of comparative religion and its kindred sciences has been pursued with great ardour during recent years, and a large number of works have been written, many of them clearly having for their object, either to find what is described as a natural basis for religion, or to dethrone Christianity from its unique position, or to point out the analogies in other religions to the customs and ideas of Christianity. To discuss these questions would be beyond our scope; I would only suggest certain propositions which may sum up the attitude that I would adopt towards these studies.

It is quite true on one side that almost every

custom or rite of Judaism or Christianity has its analogy in other religions, and may very probably have a similar source. This was better known to many of the Christian Fathers than it is to us. That did not however in their eyes, nor need it in ours, prove anything against the special revelation in Christianity, because it would be perfectly natural that God should speak to the Jews in the form and manner of existing religious thought, and that our Lord should instruct His followers in accordance with ideas actually existing among them, and not in an entirely new manner.

On the other hand the study of mankind bears witness to religion as something which satisfies certain needs. The advance of a race or nation implies also an advance in religion. Sometimes a nation as it develops itself develops a religion in accordance with its higher needs, sometimes what is higher comes from outside and itself is a factor in determining the elevation of the people. The Christian religion as revealed in Christ represents the goal towards which the aspirations of other nations have tended, and an ideal to which they must ultimately desire to conform. In no way, therefore, is it necessary for us, any more than it was for Fathers like Justin or Clement, to doubt that in a sense there has been in all nations some revelation of God, shown in the gradual development of higher purpose, of purer ideals, and continued moral progress. But nothing in them as a matter of fact takes away from the uniqueness of Christianity. In so far as other religions have been by various investigators brought into competition with it, it has been by interpreting them from a

30 THE SOURCES AND AUTHORITY OF

Christian point of view and reading into their phraseology Christian ideas.

With these few words of preface we pass on to the special Christian revelation as it is presented to us in the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the authority of the Christian Church.

There are many nowadays who would be inclined to give up the Old Testament. There are undoubtedly many who feel, that to say the least such an atmosphere of uncertainty has surrounded the Old Testament owing to the results of critical studies, that it is quite unsafe to build anything upon it. Such an attitude is, I believe, quite unnecessary. It is perfectly possible to accept most of the results, even the most adverse results of Old Testament criticism, and not lose in any way its abiding value. The history will be different, the form of revelation will be different, but the value of the theological and moral truths will remain unimpaired. My own belief is indeed that, although many important results of criticism are proved, so far as anything in such subject-matter is capable of proof, yet a great deal is, to say the least, precarious, and some of the newest developments are barely coherent or even sane. But what I wish to emphasise is that the right position is one which allows perfectly free play to every form of critical ingenuity or to all the strange vagaries of archæological apologetics, and at the same time does not give up any of the permanent religious teaching or of the authority on which it is based.

What is the authority of the Old Testament? It sometimes seems almost forgotten amid the storm of controversy that whatever may be the actual date of the various books of the Old Testament, it is quite certain that all or nearly all of them had been written many hundreds of years before the New Testament. They had become canonical, they had been translated into another language, and their meaning had become fixed long before Christianity began. This is after all quite certain, and equally certain are two or three broad propositions which may be deduced from it.

In the first place, the Old Testament taught in a manner quite unique the belief in one God. It may be that it was only by slow degrees that the people of Israel learnt this: that Polytheism made way for Henotheism and through Henotheism was learnt Monotheism. In whatever way it was learnt, and whatever traces there may be in the Bible of less perfect forms of religion and of less adequate conceptions of the deity having prevailed, in any case Monotheism, a high and elevated Monotheism, is the religion of the Old Testament, and of the Old Testament alone in the ancient world. Again the Old Testament combines in a manner which was quite unique religion and morality. The one God whom Israel learnt to worship was a God exalted in righteousness. Here also it is quite true that we can trace progress. It was only gradually that Israel learnt the lesson, and when it is pointed out we can see quite clearly older strata in the Bible which represent the inadequate conceptions out of which the religion of Israel developed. But in any case righteous-

ness, purity and holiness are the notes of the Old Testament religion in marked contrast to the beliefs of surrounding nations.

It was a firm conviction among the Jews that they were in a particular way God's chosen people, and that they had been selected from among the nations, that in them all the families of the earth might be blessed. Whether or no these words were spoken to Abraham, or whether a prophet of the period of the Monarchy chose the story in which they are contained as the most suitable vehicle for expressing a truth which he felt himself permitted to teach, in any case the belief in this divine selection and commission was firmly ingrained in Judaism, and had been so for generations before Christ came. And this special blessing for and through Israel was associated with the expectation of the Messiah. It may be, it probably is, true that many passages supposed to have a Messianic meaning were originally understood to bear a quite different interpretation; it may again be true that the idea grew slowly and from vague beginnings, but it is quite certain that the Old Testament looked forward to the advent of one, to whom the name Messiah came to be given, and it is equally certain that this belief was very strongly held among the Jews long before the Christ came.

And all these hopes and expectations and prophecies were fulfilled in quite an unexpected and unique manner in Christ. It may be that they helped their own fulfilment. This they were probably intended to do. But it does not take away from the wonderful

character of the event. It may be again that the fulfilment was different in many ways from the expectation. It succeeded in a wonderful manner in separating what was of mere temporary validity from what was of permanent value, but that does not detract from the wonder of the sequel. The preparation in the history of the Jews for the coming of Christ in all its manifold variety, and the pure and lofty conception of religion which it puts before us place the stamp of authority on the Old Testament.

I feel, then, that whatever may be the result or development of Old Testament criticism, we are amply justified in accepting its authority as a revelation of religious truth to mankind. But if we accept it, in what way can we use it? Here it seems to me that historical criticism has done a work of very great value. The old unhistorical method, according to which the Old Testament, equally with the New Testament, was looked upon as providing a number of texts which might be used without reference to their context, and without reference to their historical meaning, often even without reference to their grammatical interpretation in order to support or bolster up a system of doctrine, is clearly and definitely condemned. But at the same time the professor of dogmatic theology is not particularly concerned with Jewish history, nor with the historical steps by which the Old Testament theology was evolved, nor with the various strata in the books of the Law. It is his business rather to reconstruct the Old Testament theology as it is represented in the Bible as a whole, as it might be believed and interpreted by the

Jews before the coming of our Lord, as it is presupposed throughout the Gospels. To do so in detail might be difficult, to distinguish the varying beliefs of the different sects of the Jews might be tedious : but the broad facts of Old Testament teaching, the unity of the Godhead, the supremacy of the moral law, the sacrificial system, with its implied lessons of the holiness of God of the sin of man and of the need of atonement, the personal religion of the Psalms, the zeal for righteousness of the Prophets, the orderly ideal of family life depicted in the Wisdom literature—all these, representing as they do the foundations on which our Christian belief was built up, remain untouched by any criticism ; they come to us with an authority which is unimpaired and a value which is undiminished. The limitations of the Old Testament we may learn by the fulfilment in Christ, but its positive value has not been taken away by a criticism which only touches the account of its origin, and the obligation of mankind to its teaching will always remain.

V

As we progress our work becomes in some ways more difficult, and the issues raised more important and more controverted. We may take many along with us in believing that Nature even with the most rigid scientific interpretation witnesses to something transcendental, that the ultimate lesson of metaphysics is the reality of soul and duty, that the Old Testament is a revelation (whatever revelation may mean) of a sub-

lime Monotheism, but when we reach the New Testament we must come to a parting of the ways, for we have to decide whether for us the revelation in Christ is an unique revelation of what is true or only a stage in human evolution.

There is, indeed, an intermediate position associated with the well-known name of Ritschl in Germany, which would have us believe that although substantially the historical facts on which Christianity is based cannot be accepted yet their theological value remains unimpaired. They have the value which attaches to what is known to be practically beneficial ; they are in fact "value judgments" ; that is, propositions which whether true or not are wholesome, and we must add will have authority only for those who are willing to accept them as true, for they have no external sanction.

I do not believe that this is a position in which people can rest, for the strength and power of Christianity have always depended on the conviction that certain events really did happen. Thus a solid historical foundation was given for truths which otherwise are apart from and unprovable by human experience, and are, therefore, very hard to believe ; for although they may appeal to our higher nature they are repugnant to our lower, and need to come to us supported by some testimony outside themselves in order to gain any universal acceptance. In a sense a man can feel the truths of Christianity as being the embodiment of the highest ideals of our nature, but it is only when he has been educated as a Christian and has formed his judgment in a Christian atmosphere. The Cross was

to the Greeks foolishness, and some people nowadays are beginning to re-echo that sentiment in theory, as they have adhered to it in their practice. I am bound then, as I believe, to show in what sense and how far we can find authority outside itself for the Christian revelation as the source of Christian doctrine.

In the first place, we need have no reasonable doubts about the dates, and to a very large extent about the authorship, of the Books of the New Testament. That I hold, speaking generally, as the clear result of scientific investigation. The Epistles of St. Paul, or almost all of them, are what they profess to be ; the Synoptic Gospels give the story of our Lord's teaching as it comes to us from the first generation of Christian teachers ; the Johannine books were written at latest within a hundred years of our Lord's death. All these are facts which I consider certain, and they by themselves will be enough for our purpose. I need not now go into more disputed or doubtful points.

But here to many minds there is a great difficulty. Historical truth is, they tell us, so uncertain that nothing can be allowed to rest upon it. This is a difficulty which we inherit from the eighteenth century. It is put in its most extreme form in some words of Lessing, which I quote from Professor Harnack: "Historical truth which is accidental in its character, can never become the proof of the truths of reason, which are necessary." Put in this form, it could not appeal to us at the present day, for it is associated with a metaphysic which we should hardly be able to accept, but the feeling which it represents is still very strong.

To many minds there is something uncertain, almost unreal, about events which are past and gone, and they feel that it is hardly possible to prove anything by them. The fault is perhaps partly one of imagination. A very good modern illustration of this type of scepticism is given by Professor Percy Gardner's books. To him historical truth is in any real sense unattainable, and he would support his theology on a psychological as opposed to an historical basis. Of history, he writes as follows :—

“First, then, of historic criticism. This is a destructive force, and a force of immense power. It is liable to become historic scepticism, and if exercised unduly may reduce the fabric of history, at all events of ancient history, to a heap of ruins. For the fabric of history is not adapted to sustain the assault of methods which are reasonable when applied to things physical and visible. We cannot cross-question historic characters as we could question witnesses in a law court. Thus a direct attack on any supposed fact, if forced home, can seldom be met.”¹

This general statement is then illustrated by a particular instance :—

“It is, however, quite obvious that even in regard to outward and visible events we shall comparatively seldom be able to arrive at perfect certainty. Take an event of the present century witnessed by thousands, of whom a few were lately alive, the battle of Waterloo. Of that event there are a multitude of quite inconsistent accounts in existence, between which it is difficult or

¹ *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 127. By Percy Gardner. London, 1899.

impossible to make choice. How, then, can we hope to reach objective truth in regard to events further from us?"¹

I have quoted this second passage because the deductions that I should make from it are the exact opposite to what Professor Gardner makes. It shows to my mind how absolutely unimportant to the truth of history are the minor difficulties to which such importance is here attached. We know that there are many different stories of events which happened at Waterloo, and some of them are quite inconsistent with one another. On many minor points there are curious discrepancies in the evidence. But in spite of that we are absolutely certain about every fact of real importance. That the battle was fought, that the French army was defeated, that great political changes were the result, all these are quite as certain as any fact or law of science. They are certain because we have not only the evidence as to what actually did happen, but we have also the corroborative testimony of all history before and after. Even if by any curious accident every direct historical reference to the battle of Waterloo were eliminated from our authorities, we should still be able to prove that some such event had happened by the testimony of previous and subsequent history. The discrepancies in the narratives are as unimportant as the individual errors of scientific observers.

Now exactly the same argument will be true of the foundation of Christianity. Something similar to the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

events recorded in the Gospels must have happened. You cannot explain subsequent history unless they did. Take one fact. How otherwise can you explain the new meaning and significance attached to the word "Cross." It is only explicable on the hypothesis that our Lord died (as is recorded) on the Cross, and that in some way or other his disciples learnt of the victory of the Cross. And the same method of argument that applies to the life of Christ as a whole I would apply to the crucial fact of the Resurrection. It is quite true that there are difficulties in harmonising the various narratives, as there are difficulties in knowing exactly what happened at Waterloo. It is extremely improbable that the accounts of such an event would be any more clear and coherent than are the accounts of the details of a battle. People might be quite certain that they had had an unique experience which had influenced their whole spiritual life, yet just because of its extraordinary character discrepancies would arise in the exact accounts of the experiences. And the evidence for the Resurrection and the other transcendental events which are associated with it lies, not only in the actual narrative, not only in certain corroborative details, as the empty grave, but in the subsequent history of those who had seen the risen Lord. We know what the Apostles were, we know how the betrayal and crucifixion influenced them, we know what they became. The cause of the transformation lies just in those passages and events recorded in the New Testament records, which thus fit harmoniously and naturally into their places.

And in exactly the same way the Gospel narrative and revelation in all its completeness fits into its proper place in universal history. We know that in some way or other a tremendous change was wrought. It is very commonly stated nowadays that the Christ of the Gospels was the creation of the Christian Church. The difficulty that such a statement leaves is that some adequate cause is necessary to explain the creation of that Church. We may put it in another way. In St. Paul's Epistles we have a clear picture of the teaching and position of the Church when they were written, a picture not only of what St. Paul taught, but also of what he shared with his contemporaries. We have to find an adequate cause for the growth in a period of about thirty years of all this body of life and doctrine.

On critical grounds, then, I do not feel that there is any call to substitute for the traditional story a new theory which would compel us to reconstruct out of our own imaginations a new Christ. I am prepared to accept the New Testament as the record of an unique Revelation, and to use it as an authoritative source of religious truth. But as to the manner in which it should be used, a very considerable change has slowly been effected.

It would take us too long to work out in detail the history and growth of the historical method of interpretation. It has even yet been very little grasped by most people, and the habit still widely prevails of using the Bible—Old and New Testament alike—just as it suits a man's purpose. According to the old method, the Bible represents a theological code or

text, the words of which may be quoted and applied without any regard to the contents of the passage. In opposition to this there is a very definite historical method of using it with which we have been practised in our classical studies. Before we develop the permanent value of anything that is said, we try and reconstruct for ourselves the exact meaning of the writer from his own point of view and in accordance with the thought of the times. When that is done, when we know what was the meaning of the words of Christ as recorded in the different Gospels, what was the interpretation of them given by the different Apostles, and have worked out the origin and history of our religious beliefs, then, but not till then, are we in a position to ask what is the dogmatic system of Christianity.

The method is longer than the older way of dealing with the Bible ; it is also more interesting. It will not, I believe, change or alter our conception of the Christian Creed, but on a large number of subordinate points, just those points on which Christians have been divided, it will probably be necessary for us to give up favourite texts and favourite misinterpretations of texts, and it will be found that the New Testament often affords no solid ground for any decision on many debated points. The various systems of partisan Christianity which have been built up on isolated texts, on passages wrongly interpreted, on the misuse of the Old and New Testament alike, will gradually be found to be untenable. On the other hand, a great deal of harm has been done in recent years by the manner in which crude critical theories have been seized upon and made use of

in partisan interests by persons who are quite unacquainted with the grounds for them. Our greatest hope for the future lies in the gradual growth and spread of a sober, wise, historical criticism which may both in its method and temper check and retard sectarian partisanship.

VI

But it is impossible to limit our authority for Christianity to the Bible and the New Testament. Christianity is what it has become, and even if we would we cannot cut ourselves adrift from the Christian Past. At the time of the Reformation the attempt was made to appeal to the Bible and the Bible only as the religion of Protestants. The only result was to build up a number of inconsistent Protestant systems the whole scope and contents of which were determined by mediæval theology. Our beliefs are always conditioned by inherited teaching even if we revolt from it.

The authority of the Christian Church is claimed in two directions—Christian tradition, and the theology of the Catholic Church.

The controversy between the authority of Christian tradition and that of Scripture is one which is exceedingly unprofitable, for the antithesis is a false one. The Scriptures are simply a part of the Church tradition. But there is a real question of great importance, and that is, what Church traditions have we of a reliable character outside. I remember a conversation which

I once had with a Russian monk in which he discussed the imperfections of the English Church. St. Paul, he said, tells you that even if an angel from heaven should bid you change any of those things which I have delivered to you, you should not do so. "You have changed many things; we, we have changed nothing from the beginning." That is the claim put in its most extreme form. Now undoubtedly there was in the Church for many centuries an uninterrupted tradition of church life, and a Christian in the fourth century would have believed that the existing ecclesiastical system was based upon apostolic custom. Can that claim be made good? The answer must be in any sense in which he would have intended it, No. We can, as a matter of fact, trace historically the development of most of the elements of that system. There is quite a distinct difference in considerable detail between the church systems of the second and fourth centuries, a difference sufficient to justify us in assuming that the existence of a custom in the fourth century is no proof of its apostolic origin.

But while the appeal to tradition is not true in this exact sense, in another, it is a fact of very great importance.

Neither our ecclesiastical system nor our theological beliefs are ultimately derived from the Bible. For nearly thirty years Christianity was preached, and the Christian Church was in existence before any books of the New Testament were written; it was another twenty or thirty years before they came into at all general use; it was sixty or seventy years before they

became authoritative, and at least one hundred years before there was a definite canon of Scripture. During these years the Christian belief and practice was based on, and developed, the apostolic teaching. We know that in its substantial form it was the same as that which we accept to-day, because it has its reflection in the different apostolic writings, but Christianity was not derived from them, nor the Church system, nor the proportion and form of Christian doctrine. While then it is not safe to accept anything as certainly true which is not witnessed to by Scripture, because a tradition, if living, is always changing, on the other hand, the Church tradition is an independent witness to the apostolic teaching, and it is the tradition which gives us the true proportion of apostolic teaching and practice. The Epistle to the Romans, for example, is not engaged in a discussion concerning the Christian Faith ; it presupposes in its readers the possession of it, and discusses certain great questions which arise from it. When the Reformation theologians, then, attempted to construct their theories on the basis of this Epistle, it was not that their expositions were erroneous so much as that they distorted the proportions of the Christian Faith ; they exalted subordinate questions into primary. So also to me the whole of modern German theology has suffered because it has taken as its starting point the teaching of Luther, rather than the teaching of Christ as represented by the Apostles.

May I give an illustration of what I mean from a question which is very much before us at the present day? The belief in the Virgin-birth is part of the

Christian creed, and as we may judge from the testimony of Ignatius was part of that creed in his day. Now, there is no reason to think that it found its way there from the Gospels, in which the narratives of the event are recorded; but the Christian tradition, like the narratives in the Gospels, bears witness to something earlier than either. It is quite clear that neither of the Gospel narratives was derived from the other, and therefore they give independent witness to a prevailing belief which is also witnessed to by the Church tradition.

The Christian tradition, then, is a guide of absolute importance in interpreting the Christian revelation, and this revelation has been transformed into a theology by the Christian Church.

It is a great advantage or disadvantage, as you will, that we should have had in one of the most important theological works of the present day the very elaborate indictment of the whole development of Christianity given us by Professor Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*. The object of that work is quite clearly to undermine the authority of the traditional dogmatic theology. To judge from many comments on it which I have read, it is apparent that a great deal of it which was a commonplace to the theologian has come as something quite fresh to many readers, and has received an undue amount of attention. It is quite true that our formulated theology is the result of the Greek intellect, assisted by Greek philosophy, working on the Hebrew revelation. It is quite true that all down the Christian ages there has been a development of the meaning of

the Christian message, and that human speculation is mingled with the exact words of the New Testament. But surely this crude condemnation of what is Hellenic is quite unjustified, whether from a Christian or a philosophical point of view. The Christian remembers the words in St. John's Gospel, "He will guide you into all truth." He believes that it is a far grander conception to hold that all the wealth of the human intellect and all the product of the highest human thought have been employed in interpreting and explaining the truth once for all delivered to the Saints, and he would accept the authority of the Church of the early centuries as of the Church of the Middle Ages and of more modern times. It is quite true that we demand something absolutely simple as sufficient for our salvation, but the Christian creed has always been simple, and does not claim as necessary for salvation anything which is not implied in the frank acceptance of Christ as the Son of God. But, although the fundamental Christian belief is simple, no mind is satisfied without explanation and definition, and the work and thought of the Christian Church is part of the Christian heritage. The criticisms of Professor Harnack are often unjust and shallow, and it seems a strange service to employ all the knowledge and intellect of the nineteenth century to try and eliminate the intellectual elements from Christianity.

The doctrine of the Trinity is clearly in a sense a development. The teaching of Augustine on that doctrine is still further a development, but the whole Christian conception of God is brought out in tremendous fulness when he sums up the doctrine of the Trinity in

the revelation of Love. His basis is the revelation of Christ. This had been interpreted by three centuries of Christian thought, by all the subtlety of the Hellenic mind, and the power of the Greek language. He inherits the fruits of heathen philosophy ; his mind is enriched with the most profound spiritual experience, and he puts before us the most sublime conceptions of the Godhead which the human mind has ever been able to conceive.

The authoritative decrees of the Church formulated, in language which has not been and is not likely to be improved upon, the fundamental belief in Christ's message. The teaching of the Church has presented in every age the meaning of this message, interpreting it as it could in the language of the day. The student of the history of dogmatic theology inherits all the teaching of the past. He must distinguish what is temporary and accidental and imperfect and incomplete from what has been taken up by the conscience of the Church as a whole. He realises how each age has its faults, and each age has corrected the faults of other days. He is like a wise steward giving out of his treasure things new and old. Guided by the teaching of the past, weighing well all that has come down to him, he will attempt to interpret for his own age the Christian revelation which is true for all ages.

VII

The sources of our theology then are the continuous revelation of the Old Testament as accepted in the New, the revelation of Christ in the New Testament, the

witness of Christian tradition, and the living voice of the Christian Church. I do not believe that the results of recent discovery will be found to impair its authority, but the method of the theologian will be to a certain extent changed by critical and historical research. Using these methods, it is his business to teach the contents of the Christian revelation as answering the needs and corresponding to the aspirations of the present day as of past days.

But I suppose that to many persons doubts will arise as to the value of all this. There have been periods in our history when the discussion and study of dogmatic questions has been the most serious and absorbing intellectual interest of the age; at the present day the interest has largely gone. Even many of those who are religious would be satisfied with a somewhat vague and half-expressed religious feeling. No doubt an untrue or disproportioned theology has done harm, but that only makes a wise theology more important. I would put it to you, is it not true that a right hold of the spiritual realities of life is the one absolutely important thing for a nation, and the character and future of a nation will largely depend upon the reality and truth of its spiritual life? There are trivialities in theology as in science. Theology, like philosophy, may have degenerated into word-splitting. But theology deals with the most tremendous issues and with beliefs which have transformed human nature. And the judgment of history would be on our side. How much both of the greatness and the limitations of the Scottish character are due to their theological training? What does not

America owe to the moral strength of the Puritan settlers in New England ? I believe that a great deal of our English national character has been due to the fact that a large portion of the nation has been trained on the two great facts of "faith" and "duty." And I believe that if, in obedience to the intolerance of secularism, the nation gives up that basis for a meaningless and invertebrate unsectarianism, it will be an infinitely greater disaster than an unsuccessful war or an unwise fiscal policy. For it touches the very nerve of national life.

A nation's greatness depends upon its character, its character largely depends upon its religious beliefs, and all onesidedness and error in its beliefs are reflected in its life. The office and work of any one who is called on to teach dogmatic theology is as important as ever it was, and to restate the great truths which are always the same yet always changing in their aspect is, however little it may be realised, one of the most grand and most important of duties, and all the more just when it harmonises little with the thoughts and aims of the age.

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED,
BREAD STREET HILL, E.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

An
Examination of Harnack's
'What is Christianity?'

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE TUTORS' ASSOCIATION
ON OCTOBER 24, 1901

BY

W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D.

LADY MARGARET PROFESSOR AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH
HON. FELLOW OF EXETER AND TRINITY COLLEGES

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1901

THIS paper is printed in the hope that it may contribute a little to the settlement of opinion at a time when it is exposed to some disturbing influences. Harnack's book is but a sample—perhaps the best, in any case a brilliant sample—of a particular form of the critical movement that is most conspicuous in Germany, but also by no means unrepresented among ourselves. In it the questions at issue stand out with great distinctness; and the opportunity seems a good one for taking our bearings in regard to them as well as we can.

The paper was written some weeks ago, away from books and libraries, and I have since become aware of a number of essays and pamphlets on the subject in German besides those which are mentioned. I refer to this, not because it is likely that further study of the literature would have greatly altered my own views, but just as an indication of the wide interest that Harnack's publication has aroused. Many tendencies of the age find in it eloquent expression.

W. S.

OXFORD :
October, 1901.

AN EXAMINATION OF HARNACK'S 'WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?'

I MAY assume that Harnack's book¹, which has attracted a good deal of attention in this country as in Germany², is by this time well known and that its merits are recognized—its fresh and vivid descriptions, its breadth of view and skilful selection of points, its frankness, its genuine enthusiasm, its persistent effort to get at the living realities of religion. The nearest parallel that I can remember in English would be Matthew Arnold's theological writings, *St. Paul and Protestantism, Literature and Dogma, God and the Bible*. Harnack is indeed a trained theologian, where Matthew Arnold was an amateur; though I am not sure that in this respect the difference will be so much

¹ The German title is *Das Wesen des Christentums* (Leipzig, 1900); the English, *What is Christianity?* The translation (by Mr. Bailey Saunders) as a whole is excellent, and very idiomatic; but a few points might, perhaps, be improved. On p. 38 I think that *In dem ruhigen Gleichmass der Gleichnisse* should be rather 'in the quiet *equability*, or equable calm, of the parables' (cf. 'worlds whose course is equable and pure') than 'symmetry.' On p. 201 *Kautelen* is rather 'safeguards' than 'guarantees.' On p. 205 'theocracy' (*bis*) should be 'theocracy' (i.e. 'mingling of divinities'). On p. 206 '*pleni-tude* of its religious experiments' should be 'multitude.'

² One of the reviews speaks of it as having attained an 'astonishing circulation' (*erstaunliche Verbreitung*).

felt as might have been expected, since it is evident that Harnack's lectures were rapidly thrown off; we understand that they were delivered *ex tempore*, and taken down from shorthand notes; and they bear some marks of this in the fact that the statements sometimes stand in need of verification. And while Harnack escapes from unfortunate definitions like that of the 'stream of tendency which makes for righteousness,' I rather doubt whether he has anything quite so original and good as Matthew Arnold's account of the doctrine of *necrosis* (*Die to live!*)¹.

On the other hand, curiously enough, the theologian's is the greater literary success, because his book is so much more compact and well proportioned. It is also without the flippancies of Matthew Arnold, though the latter has passages of great beauty.

It should be said that in Germany there are distinctly two opinions about Harnack's lectures. They have been warmly praised in organs with Ritschlian sympathies such as the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1900, col. 590 ff., and *Theol. Rundschau*, 1901 (March), p. 89 ff.; but they have also called forth uncompromising criticism from representatives of Lutheran orthodoxy, like Prof. W. Walther of Rostock, and Prof. Lemme of Heidelberg².

It is a pity that both these pamphlets, but more especially Prof. Lemme's, should be so polemical in tone. Dr. Lemme is strongly anti-Ritschlian. He declares war to the knife against Ritschl, and all his following. For him Harnack's book is simple Nihilism, a radical breach with all dogmatic and ecclesiastical Christianity. He

¹ *St. Paul and Protestantism*, pp. 69-83.

² The *Theol. Literaturblatt* for Sept. 13, 1901, reviews three hostile pamphlets besides Prof. Walther's, which seem to be of less importance. One by a Roman Catholic Professor at Vienna is especially disappointing, as it does not go into the merits of the case, but only utilizes Harnack's book for purposes of party. It does, however, bear testimony to the interest excited by the book among Roman Catholic students at the University.

pursues this into every corner and strips off its disguises. He will not allow his opponent to shelter himself behind words and phrases. His language is throughout that of an impassioned challenge, to which he demands a plain answer Yes or No.

Prof. Walther is more balanced. He is well aware that there is a large class estranged from the Church. He sees that it is more particularly for this class that Harnack is writing; but he thinks that his concessions go much too far.

It may sufficiently indicate the two positions when it is said that, whereas Walther maintains that all that is left of the specific contents of Christianity is just the three points common to all religions, God, Virtue, and Immortality, Lemme would refuse to allow the last, and directly calls upon Harnack to say whether he denies the life after death or not.

It seems to me that this is pushing controversy too far. It is characteristic of the school of Ritschl to lay stress wherever they can on the tangible facts of present religious experience. There is warrant for this in the Biblical conception of eternal life, which is certainly treated as beginning here and now. It seems only fair that Harnack, if he pleases, should lay stress on this without having his faith impugned in a doctrine that he has never questioned.

Indeed, we may go further and ask if a passage like the following is not quite unequivocal:—

‘Whatever may have happened at the grave and in the matter of the appearances, one thing is certain: this Grave was the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished, that there is a life eternal. It is useless to cite Plato; it is useless to point to the Persian religion, and the ideas and the literature of later Judaism. All that would have perished and has perished; but the certainty of the resurrection and of a life eternal which is bound up with the grave in Joseph’s garden has not perished,

and on the conviction that *Jesus lives* we still base those hopes of citizenship in an Eternal City which make our earthly life worth living and tolerable. "He delivered them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage," as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews confesses' (p. 162).

It cannot be said that this is a matter of words and phrases, because the whole argument requires that the life after death should be real.

I should be prepared myself to make some allowance for the circumstances under which the lectures were delivered. They were addressed to a miscellaneous audience of some 600 students taken from all the faculties. I can well believe that the lecturer stated his case in the form that he thought would be most acceptable to them. The lectures were, as I have said, spoken *ex tempore*; and while they owe to this much of the real eloquence and fire by which they are distinguished, it is possible enough that they are less guarded and qualified than they would have been otherwise. I set down to this much of the impression of over-confidence of which the critics complain.

I

It is true that Harnack conceives of the effect of the movement to which he gives expression as a process of 'reduction.' What he offered to his audience was a 'reduced' Christianity—I think myself unduly 'reduced.' By Christianity he means the teaching of Christ, and not—as we have been in the habit of understanding it—the sum total of New Testament teaching as to the contents of the religion which Christ came to found. He does indeed speak of the impression which Christ—

'Himself and his Gospel made upon the first generation of his disciples' (p. 15, E. T.).

But he does not seem to accept the whole of that

impression as authoritative. If he had done so some of the most characteristic features of his book must have come out quite differently. He seems to conceive of Christianity as though it consisted only of ideas, of teaching. Hence we are not surprised to find that he leaves out much that we have been in the habit of regarding as essential to it. But surely the point at which he draws the line is arbitrary. Even on historical grounds the frame-work is too small for the picture that has to be got into it. It is impossible adequately to appreciate any conspicuous historical phenomenon only by its initiation. The great question of Christianity must be What think we of Christ? But we certainly cannot answer this by considering only His teaching, and stopping short of the interpretation which is given to His teaching by His followers.

I must confess to disappointment in more ways than one. It is easy enough to see that Harnack's conclusions follow from his premises. But his premises are in several ways not what I should have hoped.

His previous writings had not prepared me for the sweeping and I must needs think unjust language that is used in reference to the Fourth Gospel. I had watched for some time a certain oscillation of opinion on this head; and to the outcome as it is now formulated (p. 19 f., E. T.) I should wish to enter an emphatic protest. I will undertake to say that such an estimate though often asserted has never yet been proved. The indications of trustworthy character long ago alleged remain where they were. The Fourth Gospel does but develop features in the history and personality of Christ to which the other Gospels clearly point. On the basis of the Fourth Gospel St. Paul and the primitive Church are intelligible, but they are not intelligible otherwise. The most real objection to the Fourth Gospel is an objection to the supernatural

generally. But this objection would really reduce all the Christian documents to a chaos. We may grant a certain amount of freedom (which is often exaggerated) in the handling. The writer must have been in a position of command, and very sure of his ground. But all this tells for, and not against the beloved disciple. The Gospel is no pale hearsay reflection, but the work of one who had deeply drunk in the spirit of Christ.

To what is said about the Synoptic Gospels I have nothing to object.

'The Gospels are not "party-tracts"; neither are they writings which as yet bear the radical impress of the Greek spirit. In their essential substance they belong to the first, the Jewish, epoch of Christianity, that brief epoch which may be denoted as the palaeontological. That we possess any reports dating from that time, even though, as is obvious in the first and third Gospel, the setting and composition are by another hand, is one of those historical arrangements [dispensations] for which we cannot be too thankful. Criticism to-day universally recognizes the unique character of the Gospels. . . . That the tradition here presented to us is, in the main, at first hand is obvious' (p. 21).

It is also a sound argument that the use made in the Third Gospel of the materials found in the other two is in itself an endorsement of their value (p. 22).

From the treatment of the sources we pass on to the treatment of the history. And here at the outset comes the question of Miracles. What Harnack says on this head will cause no surprise. It is a distinct advance on the older Rationalism. It recognizes possibilities beyond the range of our common experience. And it leaves room for the substantial truth of the greater part of the narrative. This is perhaps as far as a writer like Harnack can be expected to go.

The portion of the book which follows this and which deals with the Gospel proper in Harnack's sense, i. e. with the teaching of Jesus, and more particularly with the doctrine of the Kingdom, is I think the best of the whole.

One or two preliminary sentences create a favourable presumption.

'No! The Christian religion is something simple and sublime; it means one thing and one thing only: eternal life in the midst of time, by the strength and under the eyes of God. It is no ethical or social *arcanum* for the preservation or improvement of things generally. To make what it has done for civilization and human progress the main question, and to determine its value by the answer, is to do it violence at the start' (p. 8).

It is refreshing to have the study of circumstances and conditions put in its proper place.

'We shall even refrain, and permissibly refrain, from enlarging, by way of introduction, on Judaism and its external and internal relations, and on the Graeco-Roman world. We must never of course wholly shut our eyes to them—nay, we must always keep them in mind; but diffuse explanations in regard to these matters are unnecessary. Jesus Christ's teaching will at once bring us by steps which, if few, will be great, to a height where its connexion with Judaism is seen to be only a loose one, and most of the threads leading from it into "contemporary history" become of no importance at all. This may seem a paradoxical thing to say; for just now we are being earnestly assured, with an air as though it were some new discovery that was being imparted to us, that Jesus Christ's teaching cannot be understood, nay, cannot be accurately represented, except by having regard to its connexion with the Jewish doctrines prevalent at the time, and by first of all setting them out in full.

There is much that is true in this statement, and yet, as we shall see, it is incorrect' (p. 16).

The sketch of the method and manner of our Lord's teaching is specially attractive. When he comes to speak of the doctrine of the Kingdom I am glad to see that Harnack recognizes its full range, and does not yield to the tendency which is rather marked at the present moment, and especially among writers of his general way of thinking, to tie it down too closely to the eschatological expectation.

'Jesus' message of the Kingdom of God runs through all the forms and statements of the prophecy which, taking its colour from the Old Testament, announces the day of judgement and the visible government of God in the future, up to the idea of an inward coming of the Kingdom, starting with Jesus' message and then beginning. His message embraces these two poles, with many stages between them that shade off one into another. At the one pole the coming of the Kingdom seems to be a purely future event, and the Kingdom itself to be the external rule of God; at the other, it appears as something inward, something which is already present and making its entrance at the moment. You see, therefore, that neither the conception of the Kingdom of God nor the way in which its coming is represented, is free from ambiguity. Jesus took it from the religious traditions of his nation, where it already occupied a foremost place; he accepted various aspects of it in which the conception was still a living force, and he added new ones. Eudemonistic expectations of a mundane and political character were all that he discarded. . . . The Kingdom of God comes by coming to the individual, by entering into his soul and laying hold of it. True, the Kingdom of God is the rule of God; but it is the rule of the holy God in the hearts of individuals; *it is God himself in his power*' (pp. 52 f., 56).

'The Kingdom has a triple meaning. Firstly, it is something supernatural, a gift from above, not a product of ordinary life. Secondly, it is a purely religious blessing, the inner link with the living God; thirdly, it is the most important experience that a man can have, that on which everything else depends; it permeates and dominates his whole existence, because sin is forgiven and misery banished (p. 61 f.).

All this I venture to think is exactly right.

On similar lines and, I believe, equally right is the further discussion of the relation of the Gospel to certain modern or rather standing problems: (1) to the world, or the question of asceticism; (2) to the poor, or the social question; (3) to law, or the question of social order; (4) to work, or the question of civilization.

These discussions are of much interest, and they are characterized by the same insight. Harnack has what I conceive to be the right key to all this group of questions. He will not consent to make the aims of the Gospel anything lower than the highest. He will not involve them in any ephemeral programmes. To him—

'the Gospel is above all questions of mundane development; it is concerned not with material things but with the souls of men' (p. 116).

The Gospel is not ascetic, though it does demand—

'self-denial and self-renunciation to a much greater extent than we like to think' (p. 87).

Christ did not interfere with economical conditions and contemporary circumstances. For—

'had he become entangled in them; had he given laws which were ever so salutary for Palestine, what would have been gained by it? They would have served the needs of a day, and to-morrow would have been antiquated; to the Gospel they would have been a burden and a source of confusion' (p. 97).

And yet the Gospel does preach—

‘solidarity and the helping of others.’ ‘As has been truly said its object is to transform the socialism which rests on the basis of conflicting interests into the socialism which rests on the consciousness of a spiritual unity’ (p. 100).

Jesus neither depreciates nor exalts the legal relation. He leaves the existing relations untouched. Tolstoi is wrong in supposing that He would prevent the magistrate from administering justice. And yet—

‘Jesus’ disciple ought to be able to renounce the pursuit of his rights, and ought to co-operate in forming a nation of brothers, in which justice is done, no longer by the aid of force, but by free obedience to the good, and which is united not by legal regulations but by the ministry of love’ (p. 112).

It was no less idle on the part of Strauss to complain of the Gospel as out of sympathy with the progress of civilization. That is only—

‘the ancient and constantly recurring error, that the Gospel has to do with the affairs of the world, and that it is its business to prescribe how they are to be carried on’ (p. 118).

The so-called progress of civilization is after all not so important a thing as we suppose; and the Gospel contributes more to what is best in it than we imagine.

So far, but for his disparagement of the Fourth Gospel, I could go along with Harnack well enough. Even as regards Miracles, he seems to recognize the presence of an exceptional and perhaps unique cause producing exceptional and perhaps unique effects. On most of the other debatable questions that we have come across Harnack takes the side which I believe to be the right one. But it is on the next section that I must decidedly part company with him. This is the section in which he deals with the Person of Christ.

II

He wants to have a Christianity without a Christology. He would have the Christian life without any doctrine as to Christ's Person. He is (as we shall see later) impatient of dogma, and even of doctrine in any form. And he is especially impatient of the demand that some definite belief shall be a condition of membership in the Christian society.

'How great a departure from what [Jesus] thought and enjoined is involved in putting a "Christological" creed in the forefront of the Gospel, and in teaching that before a man can approach it he must learn to think rightly about Christ. That is putting the cart before the horse' (p. 147).

This impatience shows itself in a number of negative statements. But before we come to these it is right to say that there is a discussion of some length as to the titles assumed by Christ—more particularly the titles 'Messiah' and 'Son of God.' In regard to the first of these Harnack expressly repudiates the doubt as to whether our Lord really described Himself by that name.

'In that doubt,' he says, 'I cannot concur; nay, I think that it is only by wrenching what the Evangelists tell us off its hinges that the opinion can be maintained' (p. 130).

The other title 'Son of God' he would interpret in a Messianic sense (*ibid.*). He also quotes the well-known verse, Matt. xi. 27, as not only a true description of the consciousness of Jesus but even a central point in that consciousness. In this Harnack agrees with other advanced critics, e.g. Holtzmann. Harnack, however, does rather minimize the force of this verse by confining the relation of Sonship to one of special knowledge.

'The consciousness which he possessed of being the

Son of God is, therefore, nothing but the practical consequence of knowing God as the Father and as his Father. Rightly understood the name of Son means nothing but the knowledge of God' (p. 128).

Yet even so, it is strange that in face of the admission that Jesus did definitely claim to be the Messiah, Harnack should commit himself to the following negations.

'The Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son' (p. 144).

'He desired no other belief in his Person and no other attachment to it than is contained in the keeping of his commandments' (p. 125).

'The sentence "I am the Son of God" was not inserted in the Gospel by Jesus himself, and to put that sentence there side by side with the others is to make an addition to the Gospel' (p. 145 f.).

It will be seen that in these sentences the 'Gospel' is by no means the same thing as the 'Gospels,' even if we confine that term to the Synoptics. It is something much narrower. It is Harnack's version of the leading points in Christ's teaching. When he says that 'the Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son,' probably what he means is that the doctrine of the 'Kingdom,' more especially as expressed in the parables, has reference directly and mainly to the Father, and only incidentally to the Messiah; though of course there are many sayings of our Lord as to Himself which certainly cannot be excluded: e.g. the claim to forgive sins, the description of Himself as greater than Solomon and than Jonah, the representation of Himself as Judge, and the comprehensive claim that service done to the weak and suffering is service done to Him. It is especially important to notice that in pointing to His own casting out of demons our Lord took that as proof that the Kingdom of God was really

come. It is impossible to separate the claim to be the Messiah from the teaching as to the Kingdom. For the Messiah is God's Vice-gerent in that Kingdom, and it is through Him that it is accomplished.

But apart from this appeal to the documents there are two or three passages of Harnack's own that I should like to confront with the negations just mentioned.

'It is true that Christianity has had its classical epoch ; nay more, it had a founder who himself was what he taught—to steep ourselves in him is still the chief matter ; but to restrict ourselves to him means to take a point of view too low for his significance. Individual religious life was what he wanted to kindle and what he did kindle ; it is, as we shall see, his peculiar greatness to have led men to God, so that they may thenceforth live their own life with Him ' (p. 11).

'With the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah the closest possible connexion was established for every devout Jew between Jesus' message and his person ; for it is in the Messiah's activity that God Himself comes to His people, and the Messiah who sits at the right hand of God in the clouds of heaven has a right to be worshipped ' (p. 142).

'He is the way to the Father, and as he is the appointed of the Father so he is the judge as well. Was he mistaken ? Neither his immediate posterity, nor the course of subsequent history has decided against him. It is not as a mere factor that he is connected with the Gospel ; he was its personal realization and its strength, and this he is felt to be still. Fire is kindled only by fire ; personal life only by personal forces ' (p. 145).

All this language expresses a deep and most certain truth. It is really an unconscious protest against the view that the Gospel can be adequately described either as certain new knowledge or as obedience to certain new

commandments. There is a personal force at the centre of it, a force that has no parallel in any other religion. The real object of our Christologies is to emphasize this force, and to make sure that it shall not be overlooked ; because without it Christianity is not Christianity ¹.

III

This would have been brought home to us if we had only had the Gospels ; but it stands out in still greater clearness when we pass on to the testimony of the first generation of Christians. At the beginning of his book Harnack makes considerable show of appealing to this. He says in so many words that—

‘a complete answer to the question, What is Christianity? is impossible so long as we are restricted to Jesus Christ’s teaching alone. We must include the first generation of his disciples as well—those who ate and drank with him—and we must listen to what they tell us of the effect which he had upon their lives’ (p. 10).

He even proposes to go beyond the first generation.

‘Finally, we shall follow the leading changes which the Christian idea has undergone in the course of history, and try to recognize its chief types. What is common to all the forms which it has taken, corrected by reference to the Gospel, and, conversely, the chief features of the Gospel, corrected by reference to history, will, we may be allowed to hope, bring us to the kernel of the matter’ (p. 15).

And yet in spite of these explicit promises the criterion that Harnack really proposes throughout his book is his own mutilated version of the teaching of Jesus. That and nothing else is what he means by the Gospel. Only by such an assumption as this is it possible to get rid

¹ Among the disappointing things in Harnack’s treatment of ‘Christology’ is that it comes so much short of Ritschl’s in clearness of positive teaching (cf. *Unterricht in der christlichen Religion*, §§ 19–25).

of a Christology. It cannot really be questioned for a moment either that the first disciples had a Christology, or that all the forms that Christianity has taken since their day have had a distinct Christological basis. It is impossible to do without it. Even if it were not conscious, it would be there unconsciously. And even if (as in Harnack's case) there were no positive Christology, I am very much afraid that a negative Christology would be implied.

It seems almost superfluous to spend words in proving that St. Paul and the first generation of disciples had a Christology. Again I would say that Harnack's own language implies that they had. We might suppose from the way in which he speaks that St. Paul was the first to introduce it. He quotes with approval Wellhausen's opinion that—

‘Paul's especial work was to transform the Gospel of the kingdom into the Gospel of Jesus Christ, so that the Gospel is no longer the prophecy of the coming of the kingdom, but its actual fulfilment by Jesus Christ. In his view, accordingly, redemption from something in the future has become something which has already happened and is now present’ (p. 178).

Harnack himself had said very much the same thing a little before.

‘It was Paul who definitely conceived the Gospel as the message of the redemption already effected and of salvation now present. He preached the crucified and risen Christ, who gave us access to God and therewith righteousness and peace’ (p. 176 f.).

And again a little later—

‘We have already referred to the fact that it was above all in his Christology that Paul's significance as a teacher consisted. In his view—we see this as well by the way in which he illuminated the death on the cross and the

resurrection, as by his equation "the Lord is a Spirit"—the Redemption is already accomplished and salvation a present power. "God hath reconciled himself to us through Jesus Christ," &c. (p. 182).

The following is a summary specially intended to blunt the edge of these concessions.

'That, however great the attraction which his way of ordering [his religious conceptions] may possess for the understanding, it is a perverse proceeding to make Christology the fundamental substance of the Gospel, is shown by Christ's teaching, which is everywhere directed to the all-important point, and summarily confronts every man with his God. This does not affect Paul's right to epitomize the Gospel in the message of Christ crucified, thus exhibiting God's power and God's wisdom, and in the love of Christ kindling the love of God. There are thousands to-day in whom the Christian faith is still propagated in the same manner, namely, through Christ. But to demand assent to a series of propositions about Christ's person is a different thing altogether' (p. 184 f.).

We may see from the first part of this how little in earnest Harnack is in professing to go for his definition of Christianity to the first Christians at all. The moment their testimony conflicts with his theories it is overruled.

The antithesis which is drawn between the Christian faith propagated through Christ and demanding 'assent to a series of propositions' about Him is unreal. The mind must inevitably form such propositions, whether they are put into words or not. And only if those propositions take a certain shape can Christianity really be propagated 'through Him.'

Also, whatever might be the actual order, I do not think there can be any doubt that in the logical order these propositions stand at the head of the whole series of beliefs.

Harnack denies that there is any 'forecourt' through

which a man must pass to be a Christian (p. 147). The early Church undoubtedly held that there was such a forecourt, or at least 'a gate.' That was what they meant by baptizing in the Name of Christ, and why every Christian was supposed to confess that 'Jesus is Christ,' or that 'Jesus is Lord,' or that 'Jesus is the Son of God¹.'

I do not think it necessary to quote other places in which Harnack's language virtually assumes what we should call a Christology. One or two such will meet us presently.

Neither does it seem necessary to go at length into the way in which he speaks of the Resurrection. Like the section on Miracles, what is said here goes as far as I should expect it to go. Harnack certainly does not question, what cannot be questioned, either the intense belief of the first Christians or the far-reaching consequences of that belief².

But I should like to refer in a little more detail to the paragraphs devoted to the Atonement. I do so with the more pleasure because two out of the three single out points on which I have been in the habit of laying stress myself.

I also note with pleasure that, in leading up to these, Harnack remarks by the way—

'There is no historical fact more certain than that the apostle Paul was not, as we might perhaps expect, the first to emphasize so prominently the significance of Christ's death and resurrection, but that in recognizing their meaning he stood exactly on the same ground as the primitive community' (p. 153).

The first point that Harnack brings out is the relation of the Death of Christ upon the Cross to Sacrifice in general.

¹ Acts xviii. 5, 28, &c.; Rom. x. 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3; 1 John v. 5, &c.

² See the quotation on p. 5 f. above.

‘If there is one thing that is certain in the history of religion, it is that the death of Christ put an end to all blood-sacrifices. But that they are based on a deep religious idea is proved by the extent to which they existed among so many nations, and they are not to be judged from the point of view of cold and blind rationalism, but from that of vivid emotion. If it is obvious that they respond to a religious need ; if, further, it is certain that the instinct which led to them found its satisfaction and therefore its goal in Christ’s death ; if, lastly, there was the express declaration, as we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that “by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,” we can no longer feel this idea of Christ’s sacrifice to be so very strange ; for history has decided in its favour, and we are beginning to get in touch with it’ (p. 157).

The second point is the value of Vicarious Suffering.

‘Any one who will look into history will find that the sufferings of the pure and the just are its saving element ; that is to say, that it is not words but deeds, and not deeds only but self-sacrificing deeds, and not only self-sacrificing deeds but the surrender of life itself, that forms the turning-point in every great advance in history. In this sense I believe that, however far we may stand from any *theories* about vicarious sacrifice, there are few of us after all who will mistake the truth and inner justice of such a description as we read in Isaiah liii, “Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.” “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends”—it is in this light that Jesus’ death was regarded from the beginning’ (p. 158).

On the third point Harnack becomes rather rhetorical ; and I am not sure that I can quite follow him in either sense of the word ‘follow.’ It seems however as though he were making a place for the idea of Vicarious Punishment.

It does not exactly appear how Harnack would adjust what he has said on these heads to the following sentence, which reminds us of Dr. Moberly—

‘No doubt it is true that Christianity is the religion of redemption; but the conception is a delicate one, and must never be taken out of the sphere of personal experience and inner reformation’ (p. 183).

The unavoidable brevity of treatment naturally leaves some obscurities.

Another interesting paragraph is that relating to the Holy Spirit (pp. 164–167). The strange thing is that in much of this part of his book Harnack writes, not perhaps as if he were prepared to express what he is saying in the form of a creed to which he would subscribe, but at least as though it had some solid foundation testified to by Christian experience. Only, we cannot help asking, if that were so, would not his whole conception of the meaning of the Gospel and of the essence of Christianity need to be enlarged? And would not some of his denials be shown to be hasty and premature?

But the one broad question which it seems to me that Harnack is called upon to answer is how far the remaining books of the New Testament rightly interpret the data contained in the Gospels. I do not mind his confining himself in the first instance to the Synoptics; because he would come in its turn to the Fourth Gospel, and then I think he would see—at least I should myself be fully prepared to maintain—that the Fourth Gospel does but concentrate the light upon and so reveal data that are latent in the Synoptics; it does but develop and expand, on lines which I believe to be historical, data that every other book of the New Testament (except perhaps the Epistle of St. James) shows to have been present from the first. If, or so far as the Fourth Gospel does more than this, I should be content to have judgement suspended

about it; but in the meantime I believe it to be substantially verified by the unbroken tradition of primitive Christendom.

IV

From his treatment of St. Paul Harnack takes a leap to a point of time that he fixes at about the year 200. And from this he casts back a retrospect over what he conceives to be a process of radical change.

'The living faith seems to be transformed into a creed to be believed; devotion to Christ, into Christology; the ardent hope for the coming of "the kingdom," into a doctrine of immortality and deification; prophecy, into technical exegesis and theological learning; the ministers of the Spirit, into clerics; the brothers, into laymen in a state of tutelage; miracles and miraculous cures disappear altogether, or else are priestly devices; fervent prayers become solemn hymns and litanies; the "Spirit" becomes law and compulsion' (p. 193).

Some of these changes were of course inevitable; they are recognized by all Christians no less than by Harnack. It is true that miracles and miraculous cures disappear. It is true that prophecy gradually ceases; and that for that reason the literary products of the prophetic age acquire an authority that does not extend to that which succeeds them, and that they therefore become a subject for exegesis and learning. It is true that the first enthusiasm declines, and is succeeded by a period of what may be called law and order. And yet the real antithesis was by no means so great as Harnack's description would either convey or suggest. We are intended to infer that in the Apostolic age there was nothing of the nature of a creed, and nothing of the nature of Christology. I believe that I have shown that there were both. And I am sure that the Church at the end of the second

century intended to put nothing into either that had not been there implicitly from the beginning. What is said about the transformation of ministers of the Spirit into clerics and of the position of the laity is true so far as it means that the first great wave of supernatural gifts gradually subsided; but it would not be true if it gave the impression that there was no authority, no gradation, nothing corresponding to lay people, no order and discipline in the church of the Apostles. As to the hopes for the future, they doubtless changed, as they were bound to change; and the belief in 'immortality and deification' became established in a form that has not been greatly altered ever since. Would Harnack have us discard it? I have defended him from the charge of doing so.

I am ready enough to admit that between the age of the Apostles and the end of the second century not a few things were lost. The Christian Church has always placed the first age above all others, and held that it is normative in a sense in which no subsequent age could be. But the difference and the contrast between that age and a hundred years later is not so sensational as Harnack's words might lead us to suppose. The interval was a time of steady growth, of growth perhaps through a stratum of colder air; but the roots struck deep down into the original soil.

Those of us who have studied the history of the second century are familiar with Harnack's theories about it. We are familiar with his formula :

'The struggle with Gnosticism compelled the Church to put its teaching, its worship, and its discipline, into fixed forms and ordinances, and to exclude every one who would not yield them obedience' (p. 207).

We are familiar with this, but we do not at all agree with it. Here again there is the same exaggeration that we have just noticed. The conflict with Gnosticism has

more put upon it than it can really bear. Harnack certainly cannot regard his theories on this head as an accepted result of historical science. The tendencies of recent research are almost wholly against him.

The three main products which Harnack refers to the conflict with Gnosticism are the Creed, the Canon of the New Testament, and the episcopal organization.

As to the origin of the Creed, Kattenbusch¹, a most laborious student who is Harnack's nearest and best ally on some parts of the history, takes a quite different line; he would put it some forty years earlier (± 100 instead of c. 140), and makes it entirely independent of Gnosticism. And Harnack has as yet made no reply to the incisive and as I think really valid criticisms of Kunze².

As to the Canon, it is a well-known fact that the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, written about the year 110, quotes as from Scripture from nine out of thirteen Epistles of St. Paul (including 1 Timothy, from which it is fair to infer that the full collection lay before him), and also from 1 Peter and 1 John. The inference we should naturally draw from this is confirmed by Marcion's Canon of ten Pauline Epistles (c. 140); for Marcion's was not a new list, but the correction of one already existing in the Church. Clearly the collection of St. Paul's Epistles had been made and was treated with the greatest deference, before the Church began to feel the stress of Gnosticism. And other Apostolic writings were being placed on the same level with it.

For the Gospels we have Tatian's *Diatessaron* by the year 170. Conclusive evidence fails us before this. But a number of converging indications lead me to think that the floating tradition of the second century is true which points to Ephesus, and the immediate school of St. John as

¹ *Das Apostolische Symbol*, Leipzig, 1894-1900.

² *Glaubensregel, Heilige Schrift und Taufbekenntnis*, Leipzig, 1899.

the birthplace of the Fourfold Gospel. This too was probably in existence before the time of full-blown Gnosticism.

In regard to the Episcopate the decisive step had been taken by the time of Ignatius, i. e. as we now know about the year 110. When Harnack first put forward his theory he held different views about Ignatius. But the theory has really become untenable all along the line.

The truth is that Harnack has won for himself—and that justly—a considerable reputation as a Church historian. But it is from his command of the materials, his extraordinary energy and power of production, his bright and effective style, his acuteness in seizing points and his fertility in ideas; but from these qualities far more than from the correctness of his results. The happiest of all his inspirations is his recent call 'Back to tradition.' But of the special theories associated with his name I do not think that there are many that have really stood the test of criticism.

V

The remainder of the book is taken up with a summary estimate of Greek Catholicism, Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, as they are seen to be on a survey of their history and as they are at the present day.

In such an estimate there was sure to be a large personal equation. I have said that Harnack tries to be fair and to write objectively. There is much that is generous and attractive in his appreciation of systems that differ fundamentally from his own. And yet not only here but all through the book there are certain strong likes and dislikes that are continually asserting themselves.

The foundation of Harnack's religion is the personal relation of the Soul to God. *Solus cum Solo* might be his motto. And it is true that in certain aspects no motto

could be grander or more impressive. But it is a mistake to take it as standing for the whole of religion. I am reminded of a criticism in Bp. Westcott's last book.

'The recognition "of two and two only absolutely [supreme] and luminously self-evident beings, self and the Creator" [quoted from Newman's *Apologia*, p. 59, but apparently from memory] is an inadequate foundation for Christian thought and life. We must, if we are to think and act rightly, as men, take account of the world which enters into our being and our conduct. God fulfils on earth His counsel for men through men; and no man can do his part in isolation. The work of each is influenced by the work of all. The Christian order cannot be established except by Christian men; and it is the work of the Church, the organ of the Holy Spirit, to win, to train, to inspire, to unite them' (*Lessons from Work*, p. 35 f.).

It would ill become me to speak in any but terms of deep respect of the Protestantism of Germany. It is without question the most learned of all the confessions, and there is probably no confession that is marked by a finer spirit of intellectual sincerity.

And yet in my heart of hearts I have no doubt that on the whole side of corporate and external religion the conception that prevails in those circles with which I am best acquainted (the literary and professorial) is defective. It suffers from extreme reaction.

Because this side of religion was most liable to abuse and has been most abused in the past, a writer like Harnack does not set to work patiently to correct it, but comes very near to sweeping it away altogether.

There are three things of which he rarely speaks without some disparaging epithet. They are Church, Doctrine, and Worship.

We can see the reason. He associates them all with the regulative element in religion—with coercion, constraint, and formalism.

He sees in the Church a rigid institution imposing its forms and its creeds on free minds and free consciences.

The body of Doctrine is a hard collection of formulae, very few of which really correspond with the truth.

Worship, especially the worship of all the bodies that call themselves Catholic, is a mere routine, a mockery of all that is truly spiritual.

Is this the necessary—is it the right way of regarding these ancient and venerable heritages?

Without Church, no organization; without organization, no consciousness of unity, no enterprise, no effective and powerful action.

Why should the Church be so much more unfortunate than the State? The State is able to attract a spontaneous and passionate loyalty. The State does not gall by the mere fact that it has its officers and its laws. The individual citizen submits willingly to these, because they give direction to his efforts and weld them into one with those of the rest of the community. So the national banner floats high, and he loves it and is proud of it.

Why should the banner of the Church awake a less noble emotion? If there are faults and shortcomings, invoke the collective wisdom to reform and amend them. Make it a worthier instrument of a great cause. But that will not be done by withdrawing from the common tasks and standing apart in critical isolation.

Again as to Doctrine; is not a less pessimistic view admissible? It is allowed that beliefs, like societies, cannot be wholly 'bodiless' (pp. 181, 200). They must needs take to themselves some kind of form. At successive periods of its history the Church, through its leaders, has laboured strenuously to formulate its doctrines by the

best methods accessible to it. All the time the great Head of the Church has been watching over it, and we must surely believe exercising some directing influence upon it. Are we to suppose that the larger part of the result has been mere incubus, that exists only to be thrown off? The presumption is all the other way.

And if, in the case of some doctrines, such as more particularly the doctrine of the Trinity (which Harnack rejects) the edges of the definition seem sharper than is right, this is done avowedly and openly and with the deliberate intention that allowance should be made for it. All the definitions of truth are subject to the condition that, if we could see as God sees and if we could speak as God speaks, the expression would correspond more perfectly to the reality. All doctrine is relative—relative in the first instance to the age in which it was drawn up, and relative at all times to the limitations of our human faculties aiming at that which is infinite and divine. All doctrine is relative; and yet we have faith that on the whole the Church has been guided aright. A really sympathetic and patient study of the process by which doctrine has been formed will, I think, give us sufficient warrant for believing that it has been so guided.

Lastly, as to Worship. There too the ages of faith have done 'what they could.' They have tried to offer to God of their best. And, as we look back to-day at their prayers, at their churches, at the ornaments of their sanctuaries, and at their manuscript books of devotion, we might well be glad if some future age looking back upon our own attempts in the same direction could see in them as much of high and pure aspiration, of genuine prayer and praise. I suppose that at all times and under all forms there has been a great winnowing of the petitions and of the thanksgivings that ascend to the Throne of grace. Only a certain proportion has been really accept-

able in the sight of God. Has this proportion been really less under the more ornate rituals than under the more austere? I do not know. I should not like to judge. But I have little doubt that Harnack carries his condemnations too far.

I know that he is not a bigoted writer, and that his countrymen are clear-sighted, and more ready than most men to acknowledge an error. And I wish they could be persuaded to cross-examine rather severely the assumptions they so frequently make on these three subjects of Church, Doctrine, and Worship.

Harnack has learnt in the course of his experience that Tradition is more nearly right than had been commonly supposed as to the chronology and authorship of early Christian writings. Is it not possible that it is also more nearly right than he supposes on other and more important matters—indeed just on those three that I have mentioned?

OXFORD: HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

THE
CHURCH AND THE NATION

A Charge

DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF LONDON

AT ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL

FEB. 21, 1900

BY

MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D.

BISHOP OF LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1900

THE CHURCH AND THE NATION

A BISHOP'S VISITATION is, properly speaking, an inquiry on his part into the condition of the several parishes within his diocese. It has long been customary for him, after conducting such an inquiry by means of articles, to address his clergy upon some of the points which the answers to such articles have suggested to his mind. I have ventured, on the occasion of my first Visitation, to depart from this practice, and to address you before issuing my inquiries, rather than address you afterwards, when the results were before me. My reason for adopting this method is that I wished to feel myself quite free in expressing my own opinions on matters of grave importance, and I could feel this better if I were avowedly speaking from general impressions rather than particular information. I wish to avoid the appearance of addressing admonitions to particular bodies of the clergy. Further, I am in hopes that what I may say may lead some of you to consider matters which I think it desirable to put before you, and may in some degree affect the answers to the questions which will shortly be issued. On any points raised by those

answers I think it best to communicate with you privately. In this way my Visitation may more resemble ancient methods than the more general form which has lately been substituted for them.

I am aware that this method of procedure will involve a great deal of personal trouble to myself. But when I look back on the three years during which I have been privileged to labour among you, I am conscious that the great difficulty attaching to the work of a bishop in this diocese is that of gaining an intimate knowledge of all his clergy and of their parishes. It is inevitable that his attention should be given to particular cases where his counsel is needed. So many parishes are undergoing serious changes, and present particular problems, that they perforce have to occupy his attention, to the exclusion of others which are working quietly on established lines. A Bishop of London is, unfortunately, in a position resembling that of a physician. He has so many cases of urgency before him that his time is fully occupied in attending to them. But I am glad to think that an increase in the number of suffragan bishops, and the valuable help of Bishop Barry, have allowed the formation of manageable districts, each with a head, to whom recourse can be had for general counsel and advice. I trust that all parishes are aware that they are under effective supervision, and that their general conditions are constantly being brought to my notice. It must be a matter of time before I can hope to know all the clergy as intimately as I would wish to know them. But I trust that every year will add largely to the number of those who are able to regard me as a personal friend. This

is the true relation which ought to exist between a bishop and his clergy. It is a cause of great regret to me that I have been compelled to give directions to many whom I did not know with that personal knowledge which alone can enable them to interpret rightly letters which have to suffer from the brevity which is rendered necessary by the pressure of business. The true mode of procedure for a bishop is to offer friendly, even before he has recourse to fatherly, advice. His strictly official position should very rarely be needed. I am sorry that I have so often had to address you from that point of view first. I can assure you that it has been very contrary to my own inclinations. Formal and technical relationships are not those which are in accordance with the true meaning of the spiritual work in which we are all engaged.

There are a great many points on which I could have wished to address you. It is impossible for anyone who comes to London not to feel keenly the peculiar problems which it raises, the differences between the work of the clergy in London and in other dioceses where population is differently distributed. London raises questions which are unknown to experience elsewhere, questions of great complexity. There is always a danger that their solution with reference to conditions which exist only here should react elsewhere, and form a precedent which is followed where no corresponding necessity exists. I think that perhaps this danger is not so strongly before your minds as it is bound to be before the mind of your Bishop.

Another point of great practical difficulty is the large excess in this diocese of licensed curates over

beneficed clergy. I am glad to say that the relations between incumbents and curates are regulated by admirable temper on both sides, and that the zeal of both classes is beyond praise. For this very reason any differences which arise are exceedingly delicate, and tax all my powers to do justice to the various interests involved. I do not propose to dwell at length on this subject ; but I would impress upon you all, incumbents and curates alike, the need of a very careful consideration of the nature of the relationship which exists between you, of the grave responsibility which such a relationship involves, and of the need of prudence before entering upon it, and of tact and mutual goodwill in maintaining it.

I pass, however, at once to the main subject on which I must speak. It must be a matter of very serious regret to all of you that ecclesiastical questions should for so long a time have occupied a prominent place in public attention, and should have given rise to so much controversy. Whatever may be your opinion about the importance of the points at issue, or about the need for controversy, you will all agree with me in thinking that the diversion of energy from practical work, and the appearance of disunion and dissension, are in themselves disastrous ; and that true wisdom demands that we should consider how suspicion can be allayed, and the Church be able to resume its proper task of working peacefully for the highest interests of the people. Where misunderstandings arise there is a period of mutual recriminations, which do not help forward a solution. Peace is only possible when the real points at issue are fairly stated, and are admitted. Then they may

be discussed on their merits, and the necessary limitations on private and personal wishes may be clearly discerned. The wishes and the welfare of the whole Christian community must in the long run be the test by which the issue must be decided. So far as controversy is productive of any result, it is by its power of informing and educating that Christian consciousness which must ultimately be the arbiter. This is what I have steadily endeavoured to urge, in public and in private. I would venture to urge it more formally upon you to-day, and in so doing I would try to discover some general principles which all would in some measure recognise.

First of all, I think that it is necessary to admit the importance and nature of the issue which has been raised. Its meaning lies in this—that certain tendencies within the Church are viewed with suspicion by the people at large. It is obviously desirable that, if this suspicion is unfounded, it should be allayed by frank explanation. But such explanation must have reference to the grounds actually taken by the objectors—*i.e.* to their conception of the position and principles of the Church of England—not to some ideal conception of that Church, which may be logically tenable, but has little connection with the historical past. Controversy which disregards facts and takes refuge in dialectic is not likely to lead to any profitable result. It begins by disregarding the common consciousness, and is satisfied by erecting a system which seems impregnable on paper, but has no corresponding reality. It claims a magnificent position as an unassailable ideal, and then tries to maintain itself in actual fact by allies

gathered from any quarter. The proposition that difficult questions can only be settled by expert opinion is indisputable; but that opinion must rest upon principles which are readily intelligible. The great object of any ecclesiastical institution is to keep religion in close contact with life. Anything which needs elaborate explanation or justification is to be deprecated on that ground alone.

It is, unfortunately, true that the Christian religion has given rise to many controversies and has been the cause of many conflicts. This is not due so much to the fact that the Christian religion is especially open to doubts about its meaning, as to the fact that it has a power of its own, apart from the system in which it is clothed, and has always insensibly trained its children into freedom. Christianity has created aspirations and desires which have come into conflict with existing forms of ecclesiastical organisation. The danger to which all institutions are exposed is that they are founded for the good of men, but as they become powerful they tend to exist primarily for their own good. Ease of organisation, order, and regularity are what every institution inevitably aims at. It insensibly demands that men should take the form in which they can most easily be organised and dealt with. This is the danger which has always beset the Western Church. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the history of that Church is of a series of struggles to keep it a humane institution. The central mechanism of the Church always tended to become abstract, to grow out of genuine contact with life. Great movements towards monasticism, and still more

the simple methods of the Friars, brought it back again from time to time. But gradually the central mechanism laid its benumbing hand upon these reforming movements, and checked their vitality. As the fabric became more stately it lost in effective power. When its organisation had been forged into apparently irrefragable strength, it was found to be intolerable.

This is a warning never to be forgotten. The mediæval Church fell because it had ceased to influence human life through its excessive endeavours to accommodate itself to its needs; because it expanded its system to meet the requirements of feeble consciences, which grew feebler the more they were tended; because it undertook to do so much for men's souls that men felt they were losing all consciousness that their souls were after all their own.

I call your attention to this because the question is so often raised, What happened in the history of the Church during the sixteenth century? And the answer differs according to the point of view of him who gives it. I do not think that we shall find the answer in the domain of theology. Indeed, theological considerations in themselves have rarely stirred the minds of multitudes. It more often happens that theology supplies the needful basis for a new outlook on Christian truth, which has been rendered necessary by the results of God's government of the world. This was eminently the case at the Reformation. The growth of knowledge and the development of national consciousness gave men a new sense of power and a new means of criticism.

They demanded that the ecclesiastical system should be in accordance with their knowledge, and with the sense of responsibility for their own life and actions which passing events forced upon them.

This is the general meaning of the Reformation movement; and on this basis it has been increasingly justified by events. It is a fact that those peoples which have built their life upon the conception of freedom founded on individual responsibility in the sight of God have shown a vigour in grappling with the problems of life which the peoples who remained content with a system which partially obscured that truth have not been able to display.

I mention this because it is at the bottom of the interest taken by the English people in theological questions. They are not primarily interested in them from a strictly theological point of view; but they regard with suspicion any form of theological opinions which they think even remotely threatens that idea of freedom which they rightly hold dear. Their suspicions may, in particular points, be mere prejudices; they may sometimes be unreasonable. But they demand that any ecclesiastical development should maintain clearly that sense of individual responsibility in the sight of God which was won by much toil, and has been preserved with many sacrifices. In so doing they inherit a feeling of antagonism to any system which has an opposite tendency. They are, it may be, unreasonably sensitive on the point. Yet I should hesitate to call any uneasiness on such a vital matter unreasonable; and I do not think that any religious movement can have a chance of lasting success which cannot or will

not give effective guarantees on this important subject.

Now this consideration has a practical bearing which cannot be overlooked. The question which England had to settle in the sixteenth century was not merely whether or no its Church was to continue to recognise the Papal jurisdiction, but in what relation the system of the Church was to stand towards the aspirations of the national life. So grave were the suspicions of the working of that system in the past that some countries abandoned it altogether. This was not done in England. The system was retained in its integrity, freed only from noxious growths which disfigured its primitive characteristics. The object of this process of pruning was to reinstate the Church into its proper position as the trainer of national life—a position which it had well-nigh forfeited. The Church stated the position which it claimed, the teaching which it offered, and the nature of the ministrations which it provided. The State accepted that statement; and the general result of that offer and that acceptance was the recognition of a *concordat* which is generally called the Reformation Settlement. The Prayer Book contains the Church's offer, the Acts of Uniformity contain the State's acceptance. This is expressed in the Ordination Service when everyone who is ordained priest undertakes that he will 'minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God.'

There have been variations in the Prayer Book,

and there have been variations in the Acts of Uniformity and in their application. These were made by the same authorities as agreed in the first instance to frame them. The object of the changes made in the Prayer Book was to secure the connection of the ecclesiastical system with the legitimate aspirations of the national life, and make it the trainer of all that was best in that life. The end pursued was the creation of a deep-seated sense of individual responsibility for an individual life fashioned in accordance with the Gospel of Christ. The appeal to primitive doctrine and practice was an appeal to a time before that in which external mechanism invaded the system of the Church. The system of the Primitive Church was framed for those who willingly accepted Christian truth, and wished to act together as became those who were called by the name of Christ. The mechanism of a later time came from the desire, inherent in all organisations, to produce by external means the outward appearance of a Christian life, without the inward conviction on which alone such a life can be based. From this error, which penetrated the system of the mediæval Church, our Church withdrew itself on to the solid ground of primitive practice at the Reformation. Its action, and the meaning of its action, have to be determined by reference to this primary object.

I have emphasised this obvious truth, partly because we do not sufficiently recognise how difficult this process was. It is always open to criticism in points of detail. Antiquity has a charm to many minds, especially when it can be viewed from a safe

distance and is seen through a haze of sentiment. It is hard to distinguish between what upholds and what weakens the permanent elements of character, between truth and fancy, between what is necessary to explain the truth and what fritters away its supreme claim on the intelligence as well as on the feelings. On the other hand, it is easy to attempt the impossible task of avoiding past dangers by the apparently simple process of cutting oneself adrift from the past altogether, and hoping to remake human nature by starving its finer side out of existence. If the Church of England is sometimes spoken of disparagingly as a 'Via Media,' it is so only in the sense in which Aristotle defined virtue as being a mean state between excess and defect. It is obvious that either excess or defect is easier than the maintenance of a just mean between tendencies which allure to one side or the other. Yet in this our probation lies in all things; and as members of a Church we have to admit this fact, no less than in the regulation of our individual lives. It is vain to strive and rid ourselves of this responsibility. From time to time we shall be exposed to opposite tendencies of opinion, each having much to urge on their behalf, each corresponding to a body of genuine feeling which demands our respect, and each containing some truth which is valuable, and must be absorbed when it has been reduced to proper proportion. Every strong wave of feeling shows that there is a danger of something being forgotten. We must discover what that something is, and find a place for it and for the warning which it brings. This is a difficult task, and requires much

patience. It is only possible by recognising the true temper of the Church of England, and holding to that as our guide.

The temper of individuals and institutions alike cannot be expressed in formal regulations, but is shown in the main object which it pursues and the methods by which it pursues it. The object of the Church of England is to train up its children to a sense of their responsibility as Christians, and to set forth Christian truth as something which must be apprehended from within, and must work out its fruits in a strong and steadfast character. It teaches God's truth, not man's fancies, however beautiful; it aims at developing conscience and setting it as supreme in guiding conduct. It may be said that all forms of Christian organisation claim to do the same. But their claims can to a large extent be judged by reason. A system may tend to teach men to believe in the Church rather than in God's Revelation. It may be said that the Church is only the teacher of God's Word; but it makes a great deal of difference whether I am taught to believe in my teacher, or in the subject which he teaches. In secular matters this makes all the difference between a good and a bad method of education, between one which stimulates and one which dulls the intelligence. In the same way, all systems of discipline claim to train the conscience; but it makes all the difference whether the conscience is trained to dependence on another or to a growing sense of its own responsibility. Only the right temper, informed by a true knowledge of the end pursued, and strengthened by that Holy Spirit which alone gives

a right judgment in all things, can achieve the right result. Some men, wishing to solve the difficulty at once, have tried to form ecclesiastical systems without definite teaching or discipline. They have only fallen into imperfect and personal methods of teaching, and an external or rigid discipline which has cramped and narrowed human nature. Again, we must be content to face ever-recurring problems by perpetual test and trial of passing tendencies with reference to permanent principles.

I would apply these considerations to points of controversy which are of frequent recurrence. I have said that public interest is not in theological discussion, properly so called, but is in the maintenance of the spirit of liberty, which is felt to have its root in religion ; indeed, the test of religious systems is their power of producing fruits in individual character. It is felt that the system of the Church should not be suspected of deviating in any way from this purpose, or of falling back upon methods which were rejected because they failed to produce this result. When people talk of the ‘principles of the Reformation,’ they mean those changes in the mediæval system which made for liberty, and for the training of the individual to a sense of his responsibility in the sight of God. It is easy to find fault with the selection of those principles, to examine catch-words, and find little in them. But these catch-words represent, after all, the deposit of a long period of thought. All controversies tend to run into details, to end in particular cries, to expend their energy on apparently trivial points. But behind these points,

stands the principle, with which we have to reckon. We must deal with the principle before we can deal safely with the cry invented to protect it. We may think that particular cry unworthy, or outworn ; but it is a remnant of the past, deeply ingrained in many minds, and clad with a significance beyond what it expresses. If we think it wise to attempt to do away with it, we must act cautiously, and clearly show that we are safeguarding its meaning in an equally effective and less offensive way.

Now, recent controversy, after removing all that is incidental and trivial, practically is concerned with two matters which were regarded as cardinal points in the system of our Church at the time of the Reformation. These points are—the restoration of the primitive conception of Holy Communion for the mediæval conception of the Mass, and the abolition of the disciplinary requirement of Confession as necessary before Communion. These were regarded as of vital importance in establishing that conception of spiritual freedom and of individual responsibility before God on which the Christian character was to be founded. When we look back to the history of the past, and when we consider the needs of the present, we cannot wonder that Englishmen should think deeply and feel seriously on these two points.

In considering them we must bear clearly in mind what the Reformers were trying to do. They aimed at cutting off the existing abuses which kept the people in spiritual bondage, and at establishing their reformed system on a basis which would guard against the reintroduction of the temper from which

those abuses sprung. Their reformed system had definitely to train the people of England to a clear conception of their spiritual position. It was inevitable that in the working of that system the necessity of guarding against old errors should at first be of greatest importance. The activity of those who laboured chiefly for this purpose was for some time dominant, and what had been omitted was emphasised more strongly than what had been retained. The consequence was that the complete working of the system of the Church of England was not a prominent object for some time; and it has never been the universal object of the energies of the whole Church. In the present century this object was brought into prominence, and has been pursued with considerable success. This success has been looked upon with some suspicion, mainly because it has not sufficiently explained its object with reference to the general tendencies of national life. In consequence of this defect there is still some confusion of thought between the system of the Prayer Book as it is laid down and that system as it was imperfectly carried out under untoward circumstances. This is a matter which is being cleared up by discussion, and is a legitimate subject for careful explanation.

Such explanation involves a consideration of important questions, which require delicate handling. Chief amongst them is the question of the general sentiment attaching to our services, about which people take different views, according as they regard them in reference to the sources from which they were derived, or in reference to the dominant sentiment of the sixteenth century, which emphasised the

cutting off of old abuses. On the one hand, it is maintained that these abuses have disappeared before the general spread of intelligence, and that popular taste demands a growing appeal to feelings of dignity and reverence, which are taking their place more markedly in common life. On the other hand, it is maintained that the danger of drifting back to mechanical forms of religion is permanent, that anything which enlists the feelings is dangerous, and that nothing should even seem to interfere with the supreme demand on the intelligence of the worshipper. These are opposing lines of thought, which have always existed in the bosom of the Christian Church. In the best times they have served to regulate one another. They correspond to differences of temperament. They will never disappear or be entirely reconciled. Every ecclesiastical system must make room for both. It is hopeless that one should struggle to oust the other.

Each, however, must be subject to the fundamental principles of the institution within which it claims to act. It must appeal to these principles and show its compatibility with them. The question of the admissibility of that appeal is capable of decision; and it is that question, and that question only, which the authorities of the Church have been attempting to decide. Public confidence has been shaken and serious suspicion aroused by what seems in most men's eyes to be an assertion that there are no principles which claim men's allegiance on the ground that they have been received by this Church and realm; and consequently that every individual priest is free to select from ecclesiastical antiquity

any rite or ceremony which he thinks fit, provided he applies it to the services of the Prayer Book, which may be rendered at his discretion. It is not unnatural that such a claim should cause universal disquiet; it is inevitable that it should be challenged; and it is impossible that it can be maintained.

In the light of these general considerations I shall discuss the two points which I have mentioned as being prominent in present controversy.

(1) The object of 'turning the Mass into a Communion' was avowedly pursued by our Reformers in the later years of Henry VIII. When the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. was issued, it was at once felt that this was its aim. The resistance to it was based on that ground. There was a rising in the West, and the rebels clearly stated their wishes:

'We will have the Mass in Latin, as it was before, and celebrated by the priest without any man or woman communicating with him.

'We will have the Sacrament hung over the high altar, and thus be worshipped as it was wont to be, and they which will not consent thereto, we will have them die like heretics against the holy Catholic faith.

'We will have the Sacrament of the altar but at Easter delivered to the people, and then but in one kind.'¹

This expresses a clear and definite system. The Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice offered on their behalf by the priest, who was not to be interfered with by the laity in this, his chief duty; the efficacy of this propitiation was to be maintained by perpetual

¹ Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, 1848, ii. 517 &c.

reservation, and the ordinary form of religious observance was to be the worship of the Sacrament; the priest was always to be in a condition to make his Communion, while the laity were not to do so except once a year. This was the system which, with all that it involved, the Reformers had to face. Writers about the history of the Reformation, especially modern controversialists, perpetually make the mistake of shutting their eyes to the actual facts of the popular religious life, and take the statements of accredited theologians as representing the contents of the system which was overthrown. Cranmer's answer to the rebels was to refer them to the regulations which they professed to follow:

‘The very words of the Mass, as it is called, show plainly that it was ordained not only for the priest, but for others also to communicate with the priest. For in the very canon which they so much extol, and which is so holy that no man may know what it is—and therefore it is read so softly that no man can hear it—in that same canon, I say, is a prayer containing this: that “not only the priest, but also as many beside as communicate with him, may be fulfilled with grace and heavenly benediction.” How agreeth this prayer with your article, wherein you say that neither man nor woman shall communicate with the priest?’¹

I quote this as a practical illustration of the entire corruption of the intent and meaning of the services of the Church by the exigencies of popular devotion, which strove to limit its obligation to personal attendance at a service where something was

¹ Strype, *ibid.* 523.

understood to be done by a priest, on behalf of those present, without any need of their participation.

With this view of the meaning and efficacy of the Mass went the abuses of 'private Masses, and sacrifices of Masses,' and the like. All hung together, as part of a system which could only be rooted out by going back to the custom of primitive times, and again 'turning the Mass into a Communion.' The real reason for the changes made in the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. was a doubt if the first Prayer Book had adequately succeeded in this object. On this ground it was thought wise to drop the word Mass in the second Book. For the same reason the Articles of 1553 laid down that 'the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or sin, were forged fables and dangerous deceits' (*figmenta et perniciosae imposturae*). Again I would quote Cranmer's words in explanation :

'Because without thanksgiving the remembrance of the death of Christ is not duly accomplished, men of old called this conception of the Sacrament the Eucharist ; and some orthodox Fathers called it also a Sacrifice, because it is made in memory of that one Sacrifice once for all accomplished, not because the doing of it is in itself applicable to the quick and the dead for the remission of sins. That is a papistic figment ; and because from this impious opinion, and the gain accruing therefrom, private Masses, for the most part offered in satisfaction, have so mightily grown—of which we find no mention in more ancient writers—we judge that all Masses in

satisfaction (of pain and guilt) should be entirely abolished.' ¹

I need not further pursue the manifest intention of our Prayer Book in this matter. It dealt with a people in whom the sense of Communion had been almost obliterated by a vicious and un-Catholic system. It had to train them to a sense of their Christian privileges and their Christian responsibility towards the means of grace which their Lord in His infinite loving-kindness had bequeathed to them. Solemn words are put into the mouth of the priest to address to his people: 'I bid you in the name of God; I call you in Christ's behalf; I exhort you as ye love your own salvation, that ye will be partakers of this Holy Communion.'

This is the object which the Church of England ever pursued, to make the Holy Communion a service for the people, to which they came prepared to receive the gifts of grace in the way which Jesus had appointed. Our own time has seen a fuller accomplishment of that object than any previous period has witnessed. The Holy Communion is more frequently and more reverently celebrated and administered; there is a higher sense of its value, a greater recognition of its supreme importance in the services of the Church. It is greatly to be regretted that this advance towards the due appreciation of the mind of the Church should be checked by anything which even remotely suggests a desire to return to that conception of the Holy Communion which was so pernicious. It was that conception which in the sixteenth century was denoted by the use of the term

¹ Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings*, 1846, p. 482.

Mass. Of course, it may be said that there is nothing in a name ; but when a word is associated with a long-standing controversy, it is a great mistake to attempt to revive it. Words gain a significance which cannot be removed. The revival of a word inevitably creates suspicions that what it has long been held to signify is being revived also. Few things have done more mischief than the needless use of this word, partly from a modern tendency towards brevity, but more from a desire to obliterate old distinctions, and to restore unity by agreement in words when there was no corresponding agreement in the thing signified. The same desire has led to an antiquarian revival of many of the accompaniments of the Communion Service which had been discarded as not directly appropriate to its true meaning.

It would take me a long time to discuss these even briefly ; and I do not think that the time has arrived when this can profitably be done in detail. The point I wish to emphasise is that the object of the Church of England at the Reformation was ‘ to turn the Mass into a Communion.’ The question of the methods to be adopted in rendering the service must be dominated by a regard to that intention. If that intention be loyally respected, there is a basis on which all other points can be settled. But so long as even a very few act in such a manner as to raise doubts about the ultimate end to which, I will not say their own intentions, but their methods inevitably tend, it is difficult to find a basis for discussion. A Choral Celebration of Holy Communion, announced as a ‘ Sung Mass,’ or sometimes a ‘ Missa Cantata,’ with no one to communicate with the priest, Sunday after

Sunday, certainly seems to set aside the system of the Church of England. It is this which creates suspicion, and puts a hindrance in the way of many who are honestly trying in various ways to adapt the services of the Church to the changed circumstances of modern life.

How much these circumstances have changed is seldom appreciated; and it must be remembered that any archæological revival must take into account all the changes which have affected the life of the people. This is a principle of large application. I would apply it to one point where it is not sufficiently considered: I mean the matter of the ancient rule of receiving the Holy Communion fasting. This now means a reception early in the morning. We have adopted the habit of taking food more frequently and less at a time than our ancestors. I imagine that in this we have acted wisely for our physical well-being. But if we set up an ancient rule as universally binding on this point, we forget its relation to the facts of the life of those for whom it was framed. I will not go back beyond the sixteenth century; but I will quote a writer of the time, who says: 'Ech one in maner (except here and there some young hungrie stomach that cannot fast till dinner time) contenteth himself with dinner and supper onlie.'¹ The hours of these meals were, for gentlefolk eleven and five, for merchants twelve and six, for husbandmen twelve and seven or eight. In a time when borrowed light was expensive and bad, everyone went to bed early and rose at dawn. Church-going on Sunday mornings was before the midday

¹ Harrison, *Description of England*, Book iv. Chap. vi.

meal. Mattins, as well as Holy Communion, were attended fasting, and stood on the same level in that respect as most of the business of ordinary days.

This may seem a trivial point; but you will find it well in considering ecclesiastical rules to employ the same method as you would employ in considering any other rules. They were made in the first instance from reasonable motives, which had reference to prevailing conditions. They have to be interpreted with reference to those facts if they are to be of value. By calling a custom a 'Catholic custom' you do not exempt it from the necessity of reasonable explanation. Customs were framed as helps, not as hindrances; they were not meant to be burdens to generations whose habits of life had changed. This is a point for consideration, because the desire to revive this custom as an absolute law, binding on everyone, runs counter to the desire to give the service of Holy Communion the same dignified accompaniments as generally attend Morning Prayer. If there are to be no communicants at midday on the ground of this custom, then it is difficult to avoid something which looks perilously like 'turning the Communion into Mass.'

I mention this as a matter which needs consideration. It is an illustration of the way in which difficulties arise, and will continue to be difficulties unless they are faced with reference to general principles. The indisposition to do so constitutes our real danger. It is a common cry that the Church of England is so fettered by Acts of Parliament, rigorously interpreted, that it cannot develop at will. In the face of facts this can hardly be

maintained. The change that has come over the mode of conducting the services of the Church during the last fifty years has been enormous. Those changes have won their way because they have made the services themselves more intelligible, and have adapted them to the changed conditions of taste and knowledge. Of course, no change was made without some remonstrance on the part of some ; but the law of development has steadily prevailed. This law of development, however, means making explicit what was implicit in the service. It does not mean altering the service into something else. It must be governed by the contents of what it professes to explain, and must formulate its claims with reference to those contents only.

(2) The other point which has been prominent in recent controversy is the subject of Confession. It cannot be said that this was a matter of grave concern in the sixteenth century, despite the manifold abuses to which the system had been subject. It was regarded as a matter to be decided, not so much on theological grounds as on grounds of common-sense. That some persons should require help in quieting their consciences, and should wish for an assurance of God's forgiveness, was regarded as consonant both to the facts of human nature and to the office of a minister of Christ. But that this process should be imposed as a discipline by the Church, or urged upon individuals as a necessary preliminary for receiving the Holy Sacrament, was regarded as contrary to Christian liberty. I need go no further than quote the words of Bishop Jewel, who sums up the position of the Church of England :

‘Three kinds of confession are expressed unto us in the Scriptures: the first, made secretly to God alone; the second, openly before the whole congregation; the third, privately unto our brother. Of the two former kinds there is no question. Touching the third, if it be discreetly used, to the greater comfort and better satisfaction of the penitent, without superstition or other ill, it is not in anywise by us reprovèd. The abuses and errors set apart, we do no more mislike a private confession than a private sermon. This much only we say, that private confession to be made unto the minister is neither commanded by Christ nor necessary to salvation. . . . But you say, “St. Chrysostom saith, ‘Our priests have power utterly to cleanse the filth of the soul.’” And who saith otherwise? When we consecrate priests, we pronounce Christ’s words over them: “Whose sins you do forgive, they are forgiven.” But are sins forgiven only by private confession? If so, how happened it that there were no private confessions used in the Church of Constantinople during the whole time that St. Chrysostom was bishop there?’¹

Our Reformers had no fear of Englishmen again becoming priest-ridden; and for my own part I share their entire confidence. The first Prayer Book placed confession to Almighty God as the first duty incumbent on all who came to receive the Holy Sacrament. If anyone’s conscience was troubled and grieved, so that he lacked comfort, he was advised to go to a priest. The Exhortation continued:

¹ *Defence of the Apology.* Jewel’s Works. Parker Society, 1848. Pp. 351-2.

‘Requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men’s minds or consciences; where as he hath no warrant of God’s Word to the same.’¹

These words were omitted from the Exhortation in the second Prayer Book, most probably because it was felt that they were appropriate to a period of transition, but were not necessary permanently. But the last clause, bidding every man ‘to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men’s minds or consciences, where as he hath no warrant in God’s Word for the same,’ contains a precious indication of the temper of the Church of England, its fairness in maintaining Christian liberty, and its recognition of that fairness as being the very atmosphere of God’s Word.

The position of the Church of England is that Confession is left to every man’s discretion. It is not to be enjoined, still less to be enforced by the clergy. Everyone is advised to try and quiet his own conscience first, and if he needs further help, he may seek it at his own responsibility. No man can

¹ *Liturgies of Edward VI.* : Parker Society, p. 82.

judge of the needs of another's conscience. He may have his own opinion about his wisdom, and he may use his influence or give his advice; but he may not judge another's mind or conscience. It is his own, and he must accept the responsibility for its keeping.

Loyalty to the principles of the Church of England requires that this liberty should be respected on all hands. The Church does not impose Confession as a discipline: it recommends, in the first place, confession to Almighty God; it reserves private confession for cases where a man is unable to quiet his own conscience. No teaching should be given by the clergy which does not state all these facts. Disquietude has been caused by a belief that habitual confession is urged by some as a practice necessary for the highest form of the Christian life, and as in itself a desirable means for the formation of character. This is in no way the teaching of the Church of England. The normal character is to be formed by a quiet and consistent walk with God, according to the dictates of a conscience trained to constant openness before Him. Serious lapses into sin, the consciousness of evil habits which have formed a fetter, the awakening of remorse for sins which have long been concealed—about these and suchlike things counsel and comfort may be sought according to the wish of him who seeks it. But this does not justify a recommendation of Confession, particularly to the young, still less the attempt to impose it as a preliminary for Confirmation, or to require it before partaking of Holy Communion. It is not a matter to be urged on the young or the impressionable, but

is to be left to the discretion of those whose minds are mature.

There can be little doubt that the practice of Confession has grown of late years ; and I think it behoves those who view this increase with alarm to investigate the causes, and try to supply a remedy. Clerical influence on the part of a few does not sufficiently account for it. I think that it arises from two features in the modern life of great populations, which call for serious attention. One is the increasing pressure of a sense of bustle and hurry, which creates a feeling of personal helplessness. The mechanism of life is so powerful ; there is so little room for quiet and reflection, that many people who wish to escape the power of the world find it easiest to do so by providing definite refuges for the purpose. This is to be met by adapting the teaching given in sermons to the actual needs of human life. Private confession is frequently prompted by a desire to supply the lack of personal help which is felt in the general teaching given in our churches. A second cause is the decline in parental authority, which largely proceeds from the decay of family religion. This I know comes from many causes ; but it is absolutely necessary to replace it by all possible means. Without family worship, regularly conducted, without a sense of public worship attended by the members of a family united for that purpose, we lose the basis necessary for the parental guidance in matters of personal religion. If parents claim their children's confidence, they must deserve it. A clergyman's task, be he never so discreet, is made very difficult when he finds that he cannot refer the

questions of the young to the decision of their parents with any expectation that they will be seriously answered.

There are points concerning the changing tendencies of modern life on which, personally, I should prefer to address you at length, rather than speak on these matters of lesser importance. But it is unfortunately easier for human activity to busy itself with small questions of organisation than to face real problems. It is easy to pursue a system and frame small regulations: it is difficult to follow out their real influence. It is the defect of all systems that, in proportion as they are developed to perfection, it is found that people have moved away from their control. It is easy for a diligent and hardworking clergyman to mistake the enthusiasm of a small and select body who gather round him for the beginnings of a popular movement. There is a danger in the natural desire to form a band of devoted adherents. We have to learn, as life goes on, to beware of trusting to our natural gifts, to our personal influence, to the impression made by devoted and self-sacrificing work. We have to guard against the fallacious impression produced on our minds by our own best qualities. We are ministers of God and of His Church. Our work is to lead men to rise to a consciousness of their rightful position as children of God and members of Christ's Church—of Christ's Church, not any narrow form of it, not our own Church in which we minister. It is a confession of failure on our part if small points in our way of conducting the services of the Church should seem to be of such vital importance that any change in them

is felt to be a disturbance to devotion. There are phrases in use, about 'privileges which we have enjoyed for so many years,' which I prefer to regard as mere phrases, containing no real truth of heart and spirit.

I have spoken to you about the great note of the Church of England—to teach the people of this country the Catholic Faith, with the directness and simplicity with which the faith was taught in primitive times, when the appeal was made to the conscience and intelligence of the body of believers. If this dominant note be admitted frankly and unreservedly, there would be little discussion about details. If the spirit and temper of the Church be observed, we have the whole history and antiquities of the Christian Church to use for our edification. But we can only use them in the spirit of freedom, with reference to the principles of our Church, and in accordance with the work which we have to do for the English people. There have been times when the Church of England failed to understand fully its own principles, when it was too insular, too suspicious of the great heritage of the past. This is not to be redressed by a sudden revival of antiquarianism which disregards English traditions and slights the principles of the English Church. There is much to be done in the way of stating these principles to the full, and acting loyally in accordance with them.

I have been speaking about the temper and spirit of the Church. This is not to be found in small regulations. It cannot be so expressed; nor can its system be enforced in reference to points of detail only. There

are some points, at a time when appeal is being made to the letter of the Prayer Book, to which I feel it right to direct your attention.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the system of the Church contemplated that the service of Morning and Evening Prayer should be said daily in every church. The words of the rubric are clear about the intention with which it was framed. 'The curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel, being at home and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministereth.' The rubric was drawn up at a time when more than one minister in a parish church was practically unknown. The order could not be made absolute, as he might be away. Moreover, the ordinary parish contemplated by the framers of this rubric was of large extent, and duty might call the priest to some distant part at the accustomed hour of service. There might be hindrances occasioned by the nature of his necessary work. The order, therefore, was not made absolute, and consequently cannot be enforced. But it was assuredly not contemplated that the trouble of opening the church, the small number of people who could be expected to come, the opinion of the individual clergyman that he could spend his time more profitably, or suchlike things, would be taken to be reasonable hindrances. The intention clearly was that the daily worship of Almighty God in every parish should be a continual testimony of the Divine presence, and of the supreme claim of God to the devotion of all men. The tolling of the bell was to be a sign and token, a solemn reminder

of what some were doing made to others who might be unable to be present. No multiplicity of meetings, or means of attracting divers classes of the community, can make up for the diminution of that solemn testimony. The universal adoption in every church of this plain direction of the Prayer Book would do more to bring us all together in a proper understanding of our common duty than anything else. It would be a blessing to the spiritual life of the clergy; it would be a setting forth of the duty of prayer more valuable than occasional exhortations, however forcible; it would emphasise the source and object of all other activity; it would train many people to a higher conception of devotional life. Our appeals, even in spiritual matters, are often too purely utilitarian. We judge too hastily of what is the most useful way in which we think that we individually can work. We forget too readily the force of the consistent maintenance of an ideal. The sound of the church bells summoning to daily prayer, the clergyman's withdrawal from other work that he may pray, the sight of his regular walk to church at the appointed hours—these, if universal, would be a continual lesson, a perpetual sermon, which would touch many hearts, and would steadily grow in power and effectiveness.

Again, it is laid down in a rubric that 'the curate shall declare unto the people what holy days or fasting days are in the week following to be observed.' This is not always done, though it is clearly meant to be part of the system of the Church's teaching. The number of such fasts and festivals was carefully arranged, so as to lay no

impossible burden on anyone. The doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church and the Communion of Saints are set forth by reference to the Apostolic founders of the Church. The many lessons to be learned from them should not be forgotten. When notice is given of days to be observed, and a Collect, Epistle and Gospel is provided for them, it is obvious that such observance was intended to include a celebration of the Holy Communion. Again I say we should gain enormously if the system of the Church was carried out in its entirety. We cannot drop any part of it without a loss to ourselves and to our people. Loyalty to the Church demands that we should scrupulously observe the intention of its commands.

Again, the recitation of the Athanasian Creed is ordered on certain festivals. It is not said in all Churches. Certainly, loyalty to the Prayer Book demands that it should be said as appointed. If a time of controversy has any lessons to teach us, scrupulous fairness should be one of them. The standard to which all fair-minded men appeal is the standard of the Prayer Book, honestly interpreted and loyally obeyed. There is a natural tendency for everyone to think that his own deviations are obviously excellent, and are necessary adaptations to popular needs. We see that danger begins when each man undertakes to judge his own cause, and dispenses himself from the need of too strict obedience. The answer must be the same to all. There are lawful and constitutional means of raising questions and proposing amendments. Such means are an appeal to the voice of the Church, which is to be sought for in appointed ways, and not assumed by

each one according to his own preference. There are many points on which the wishes of the clergy and the congregation may have free power of choice; but such points must not affect the system and the principles of the Church. These must be free from danger; and the more active we are, the more ready to try experiments, the more necessary it becomes that we should submit our experiments willingly to authority, being conscious of the danger of rashness, of the insidious development of unwholesome tendencies, of the temptation of being engrossed in our own immediate sphere—to the disregard of the claims of unity and of the maintenance of Catholic truth in its purity. When we consider the importance of the work entrusted to us, what earnest-minded man would wish indefinitely to increase his responsibility? Who would not wish to have his sphere curtailed for him, knowing its real vastness? Who would not welcome control to set limits to his own individual temper, to preserve him from hot-headed counsellors, to give him that sobriety and that sense of order which are necessary for the minister of Christ? We need to be saved from conflicts of passing opinion; we do not need to court them. The world with its passionate cries, which change from day to day, is surging around us. Let us beware lest we echo those cries. Let us labour to keep ourselves unspotted by the world. It is our duty to deliver our message in tones which are sympathetic to all the highest knowledge, the noblest thought, and the loftiest aspirations of our time. We fail in this entirely if we lose ourselves in questions of mechanism, if we waste our strength over trivialities, if we apply

our minds to profitless pedantry. The forces that are moulding England are not expressed by those who are deeply interested in maintaining that it is desirable to use incense in our services ; nor are they expressed by those who are interested in maintaining that such a use is not desirable. They are expressed by that silent multitude who are amazed that, with so many problems before us, so much energy and effort should be expended on such a question at all. We must get back into connection with realities. We must face the needs of men's souls.

I know that these needs are not forgotten, even when controversy waxes high. But we must not only do our work—we must be recognised as doing it, and doing it in the right temper. No sacrifice is too great for this purpose. Let us be men enough to agree. There is only one possible basis of agreement—the frank acceptance of the historic position of the Church of England, based on a recognition of its great possibilities in the future.

This is the one thing which I have had in mind in what I have said to you. If I have not made my meaning clear, I am willing to explain it further to anyone. I am willing to advise you on any points which you may bring before me. My desire is for the greatest freedom possible : but freedom can only be maintained in reference to intelligible principles.

My brothers, we have much work to do for our country ; and we have much to learn before we do it rightly. Much has happened lately that has given us all great food for reflection. Surely we have felt the meaning of our national life more clearly than we ever did before—its meaning not only to our-

selves, but to the world. Our reflections have not led to much if they have not convinced us of the part which the Church of England is called upon to play in the training of the English character. Other forms of religious organisation only too faithfully represent that character as it is, and have no sufficient basis from which they can broaden it and enlarge its sympathies. This is our special work. It cannot be done in haste. The old lines of national development must be carefully followed. I recognise the germs of a noble aspiration in attempts to break down England's insularity by schemes for the corporate reunion of Christendom. It is an object which we all pray for, that God would heal all our divisions and make us one. But plans for structural unity hinder that unity of spirit which must come first. They repel many more than they attract. Outward forms are but coverings; charity grows from within. The great hindrance to the growth of charity is want of confidence in one another's intentions.

You have much work to do. You are doing it bravely and well in your several spheres. But the call of a time like the present to each of us is to rise above our personal aims, our individual work, our private preferences, and face the great issues of the future of our Church and nation. It behoves us all to think and pray our self away, and try and discern God's good pleasure. We are not only messengers and stewards, we are also the watchmen of the Lord. I feel profoundly how great a responsibility, how heavy a strain is cast upon us of this generation. Shall we not bear it? If we are to do so, we must

be prepared to sacrifice our personal wishes, to repress our excessive individualism, to set an example of combined action for the common good, to use the abundant means which God has put into our hands for the work which He day by day reveals to us more and more. With the cry sounding in our ears, 'Arise, shine,' how can we waste time by disputing about the shape of our lanterns?

My brothers, I have spoken. God grant that what I have said may lead us to a deeper sense of the greatness of our mission. We are God's ministers, and our strength comes from God. Let us seek it where alone it is to be found, looking 'not at things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.' Therefore 'be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live at peace: and the God of love and peace shall be with you.'

THE PLACE OF THE BIBLE
IN SECULAR EDUCATION.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE
TEACHERS UNDER THE
LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

BY STEWART D. HEADLAM.

Women's Printing Society, Limited
66 & 68, Whitcomb St., London, W.C.

TO THE TEACHERS UNDER THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

It is with great regret that I face the fact that the relationship which has existed between us for the last fifteen years will soon be terminated. During that period I have on behalf of the people of Bethnal Green taken some share in the supervision and management of the work in which you have been so arduously engaged : and before I cease to be a representative of Bethnal Green, elected for educational purposes and for such purposes only, I want to bring before you a matter which has been on my mind for some time.

I refer to the teaching of the Bible in our schools.

You know what the rule of the Board is on this subject : " That the Bible shall be read and there shall be given such explanations, and such instruction therefrom in the principles of the Christian Religion and of Morality, as are suited to the capacities of children."

You know further that it is ordered " that no attempt is to be made in the schools to attach children to any particular denomination."

You know also that the Cowper Temple clause does not forbid the teaching of dogmas and doctrines, but only orders " that no religious

catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the schools."

And you know, finally, that the character of your Bible teaching is to a considerable degree influenced by the character of the questions set year after year by the Board Inspectors for the annual examination.

Now it seems to me to be certain in view of these facts, and of the further fact that there are at present many people interested, and some very much excited about religious matters, that the question of the Bible teaching will loom pretty large at the coming London County Council Election, and perhaps at the Borough Elections also.

Moreover, as the result of those Elections, and of the two last Education Acts which kill your School Board, new eyes will be upon you, probably many jealous, hostile eyes, but certainly new eyes.

It behoves you therefore that in this, as in every other detail of your work, you should be thoroughly up to the mark, that you should not be found doing anything which you cannot reasonably defend.

Let me tell you frankly how the matter strikes me.

You have a splendid opportunity for dealing with the Bible in a reasonable and sensible way: you have on the other hand nothing to prevent you from dealing with it stupidly and unintelligently. You can spoil it completely, making it pretty certain that your children will grow up unconscious of its inspiring beauty, and its intense interest: this you can do by treating it as a collection of texts, as a storehouse of dogmas,

religious or moral : or you can give your children such an introduction to it as literature that they will be attracted to it often afterwards.

It is indeed with the Bible as literature that you have to do : especially with those parts of it which are classical literature, literature of the first class.

I wish I could assume that each one of you had read and re-read Matthew Arnold's *Literature and Dogma* ; now that the Rationalist Press has issued a sixpenny edition (providing thereby a most valuable answer to many of their other publications) this book ought to be in the hands of every teacher. You will find all Matthew Arnold says there on the Bible as literature most valuable ; all he says about the folly and danger of deducing dogmas from Bible texts equally valuable : though you will not, in my opinion, find a sufficient appreciation of dogma in its right place, and with its proper sanctions. For dogma, of course, is of the utmost importance : the best dogma is the authoritative utterance of the best men in the Christian society throughout the ages : it is the concentrated philosophy of the Church : but it must come from the Church and not from the State : it is the business of the Minister of Religion, not of the Schoolmaster in our Common Schools.

But to give to the people, still worse, to give to the people's children, that great collection of Hebrew literature which we call the Bible, especially in the unedited condition in which it is generally sold, and to tell them to get their religion from it, or to get the "average creed" of the nation from it, or to get the "basal beliefs of the Christian Faith" from it, is in my opinion not only folly, it is cruelty : it degrades

both religion and literature: it is the fruitful cause of atheism and indifference.

Dogma, doctrines, creeds, are therefore necessary: if any of you, now that we are parting, care to know what I think as to the value of the authoritative teaching of the Church in which I am a Priest, you will find it in a book on the Church Catechism entitled *The Laws of Eternal Life*.

But your business as schoolmasters in the people's schools is not with this, not with dogmas, average creeds or basal beliefs: neither is it your business to express or imply to your children any kind of contempt for these things or disapproval of them.

In the present controversy what has led, or what ought to have led, virtuous men to resist the law is not that priests are obnoxious, or creeds baneful, but that privately appointed people, priests and others, are allowed to spend publicly collected money: and that creeds and dogmas are to be taught at the public expense.

The sacredness of the priest's office, the inestimable value of creeds and dogmas are not in question. Some of the most zealous Churchmen are at one with the most political Non-conformists in saying that the contention is that these things should not be introduced into the common schools.

It is very fortunate for you, therefore, that in your sacred office of schoolmasters you have properly nothing to do with these matters. With the Bible as literature you ought to be able to deal: but religious dogmas you rightly leave, without either expressed contempt or expressed appreciation, to the officers of the societies to whom the dogmas are precious.

But here I am brought to a pause ; and I ask do you so leave them ? The Cowper Temple clause does not compel you to do so ; on the contrary any dogma or doctrine you choose can be taught under that clause provided only it is taught in the most unintelligent way, *viz.*, by founding it on a text of the Bible instead of upon the decree of a Society : the dying School Board has doubtless discouraged such teaching but it has not forbidden it : and it is quite possible for the County Council, which is to be elected in March, to order it. Moreover, there is one dogma, in my opinion a most pernicious one, which some of you have directly, and many of you indirectly taught—the dogma that the Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants.

I need not quote in support of this the fact that an excellent teacher (whose history lessons have been a delight to listen to) when she was dealing in her Bible lesson with the Parable of the Sower, asked the girls “What is the word of God which is sown ?” They gave, all of them, valuable answers : “No, no,” she said, holding up the badly printed, unedited, Apocrypha-less version of the Bible with which we supply you, and opening its leaves before them, “No, no, this is the word of God.” I need not quote this to prove my case because I expect that there are some of you who would be anxious to acknowledge that you had treated the Bible very much in the same way. Such teaching is not intelligent, and of course is grossly unfair to the Church, to those who hold that our Lord Jesus Christ and not the Bible is the word of God : and it is this kind of teaching which enables Churchmen to whisper humbly—in fear of Dr.

Clifford—that the passive resisters are not quite logical, that some Churchmen do have to pay for the teaching out of public money of a dogma which they abhor.

And then, too, I am brought to a pause when I consider that I have said that with the Bible as literature you ought to be able to deal: perhaps I was wise in saying “ought to be able.” But are you able? With your multitudes of “advanced sciences” are there not some of you who are a little weak in literature? Faithful are the wounds of a friend and you will pardon me: but when I remember what rubbish some few of you have chosen as the “standard English author” from whom to select your poetry: when I have seen pretty often what you are pleased to call intelligence taking the place in the recitation of the poetry of feeling, I am doubtful whether some of you have quite sufficiently prepared yourselves for dealing with this great classical literature sympathetically, whether you have much appreciation of the Bible as literature at all. I wonder how many of you have made your own the book which the greatest of School Inspectors, and one of the greatest of the poets and critics of the end of the last century, wrote specially for your benefit: Matthew Arnold’s little shilling book introducing and editing the great prophecy of Israel’s restoration. I would I could think that that was the book which had been a kind of standard or guide to you in your dealing with the Bible.

No, I fear that those of you who have abstained from inculcating religious dogmas in your Bible lessons: who have kept free from the banality of Scripture proofs for this or that

doctrine, who have been too humble to assume to settle what is the average Christian Creed of Englishmen, or what the "basal beliefs of the Christian Faith," have still felt it to be your duty to make Bible texts a basis of moral dogmas—forgetting to make it clear how gradually is the growth of morality revealed in that marvellous collection of books, and how in the Bible the morality is suggested, not enforced. Hamlet you remember says "the play's the thing wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king," and the play does it with a vengeance. Polonius, on the other hand, gives some most excellent moral maxims, but they are ineffectual. So it is with the Bible—read it rationally and it will indeed catch your conscience; treat it as a collection of dictated texts on either religion or morals and it will prove worse than useless.

Now I believe that many of you do treat the Bible thus reasonably, but I doubt whether all of you have quite felt yourselves able or free to let yourselves go, and to treat, say, the poetical parts of the Bible as real lovers of poetry treat the author whom they love. I doubt whether even in your ordinary school-work you have not allowed those who act as if the main object of education was to get correct answers to sums and to get our language spelt and pronounced as the upper classes spell and pronounce it, to over-rule you. Whether in your time-tables you have made enough of literature, and so whether you have not made it more difficult for you to treat the Bible as literature.

But someone may ask me if we treat the

Bible in this way as literature, and read it, not indeed as an uneducated person reads any other book, but as the best people read the best books : if, in fact, the Bible is not the dictated word of God, if it is not "an infallible book both of history and doctrine," why all this fuss about it? What is the Hebrew literature, beyond all other literatures, that we should lay such stress upon it? As our old friend, Mr. Lowerison, said quite truly but entirely irrelevantly, to the delight of those who wanted to attack you, and to the dismay of many of your friends who had no solid ground for their belief that the teaching of the Bible in the schools was most valuable, and the attempt to teach dogmas most dangerous; "Buddha and Confucius are my brothers as well as Jesus." Quite so, but Buddha and Confucius (or was it Socrates—it makes no matter—*Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto*—) do not hold the field in England. They have not engrained themselves into the life of the nation, they are not an essential part of our history and literature. And if any of you say to this, "Are we then to teach that Jesus Christ was a mere man?—to that we will never consent," I reply that "mere" can only be applied to man by people like Mr. Bernard Shaw and Shakespeare's Timon of Athens : that though Christ was perfect Man it is not your business to say so, but to let the story of His life speak for itself; and that certainly it is not your business either to assert or to deny that He was perfect God. The great dogma of the Godhead of Christ does not depend upon the Bible and was believed and acted upon before the Bible came into existence. It is for the theologians—the clergy—to deal with this

dogma, if they would only leave off doing other people's work and do their own work: but they can hardly quarrel with you if by your efforts the story of Jesus Christ is impressed on the imagination of the children; for some day, if they have time, they will tell them "He that hath seen Christ hath seen the Father," and that Christ has "taken the manhood into God."

The Bible then, especially that part of it which deals with the story of Jesus Christ, in no way throws contempt on other literatures, and to say that Buddha is your brother is (largely through the influence of the Christian religion, which in dogmatising on the Fatherhood of God dogmatised also on the Brotherhood of Men) now a platitude: but still there is little chance of Buddha getting much hold in London. I am very glad to think that by the efforts of Mr. Stead in his little penny books, and by means of other popular books, legends from other lands and from other religions are becoming known to our young people; but they don't yet hold the field, and if they did there is this eternal reason in favour of the Hebrew Scriptures.

I give it you as I learnt it, I don't profess to have discovered it—for if the Heuristic method is to be adopted which teaches that no boy may be taught that the date of the Conquest is 1066 till he has discovered it for himself: that no one may speak of Julius Cæsar, or Jesus Christ, or Napoleon, or St. John, till he has himself proved their existence, then I am afraid I, with a few others, will have to retire—I suggest to you, however, this:—That just as the best Greeks were keen and eager in their search after wisdom

and their love of beauty: that just as the best Romans were devoted to civilisation, law and order: so the best Hebrews were consumed with the conviction that righteousness was the main thing, and that the great eternal power of whom most people had some notion was one, and was righteous, and wanted all men to be righteous, and they expressed this in their best books. And therefore as "conduct is three-fourths of life" the literature of conduct is the most important of literatures.

Hence your Bible lessons: which all the women teachers delight in—and would resign rather than give up—but which some of you men do not altogether appreciate.

But if all this is so, and if the Bible teaching is to continue and be made reasonable in our schools, then I grant you the Bible wants putting into order, editing: and your difficulties with the version we give you are not inconsiderable.

The ordinary person says, oh, that is the business of the clergy or the professors of theology. Against that notion I want to protest as strongly as possible—their business is with dogma, and a most important business it is, a more important business than putting the Bible into order, at any rate an entirely different business. The notion which I fancy is entertained by some atheists and clergymen and by the late Pope that the Bible belongs to the Church seems to me altogether erroneous: the Church existed long before the Bible, and could go on without the Bible: the Bible must be dealt with without bias either of atheist or theologian by the literary people. I should think that an intelligent Jew without too much Judaism about

him could manage it very well.* Some one at any rate should do for the Bible what Dr. Furnivall has done for Shakespeare in his most valuable Leopold edition published by Cassell's. I know that learned people without end have written treatises—but what is wanted is the best modern knowledge put quite plainly.

This, we want to be told, is the date which the best critics have given to this book; these portions are old traditions of unknown date: these for certain of this date: this is the true translation of this word, if it is against the law to print it we will leave it out, but in the name of truth we will not mistranslate it; neither in our translation will we put in a word to help to prove a doctrine: there is no need to do so, we are not theologians, and besides these dogmas depend not on the words of the Bible but on the decrees of the Church and the necessary demands of the human mind. And so you would go along—not leaving out the Apocrypha—and what a book you would get: well printed of course, with the beautiful Elizabethan English retained, but with the certainty that the whole arrangement of it was such as no critic could gainsay. Though probably as to the dates of much of the literature the historians are still so ignorant that there would be on that matter no finality at present.†

* Dent's "Temple Bible," valuable as it is, fails because it does not "disentangle a misplaced passage from an irrelevant context," and leaves obvious mistranslations uncorrected. The "Cambridge Bible" on the other hand, gives you what the editor considers to be the right translation in the notes, which take up more than three-fourths of each page! What we want in Bethnal Green is a correct translation into good English, with a short introduction and the fewest possible notes at the end of each book.

† Since I have written this I have found a little book by a former assistant in one of the Bethnal Green Schools, which as

I feel certain that if this was done the essential beauty of the best parts of the Bible would assert themselves in such a way that no lover of literature would be able to resist them.

Your arithmetician would still find mistakes, but what of that ? as Frederick Maurice taught, (every one of his books on the Bible you ought to read) what are these calculators worth ?

“To have a quantity of criticism about the dung in the Jewish camp and the divisions of a hare’s foot, thrown in my face, when I was satisfied that the Jewish history had been the mightiest witness to the people for a living God against the dead dogmas of priests, was more shocking to me than I can describe.”

But really I am not sure whether a lighter touch will not deal with these mathematicians better: so I quote from memory lines of my boyhood :

“ There was once a Bishop Colenso
Who could count from one up to ten,—so
He found the Levitical
Books to eyes critical
Unarithmetical
And has written to tell the black men so.”

However, anyone who had the honour of meeting this same Bishop Colenso, as I had in the old days in Bethnal Green, will know that after all the main thing he told the “black men” was the sacredness of their national life.

But all the same all the fuss about inaccurate calculations and unscientific statements are of but a paltry significance.*

far as it goes would form a valuable introduction to your biblical studies.—*The Building of the Bible*, by F. J. Gould, Watts & Co.

* I have, since writing this letter, read the introduction to “Dent’s Bible”: and find there episcopal sanction for much that I

Right through, the whole thing can be made to live—these are the early beliefs of a little nation which has had more influence in the world than many empires: this is the tradition about their laws edited hundreds of years afterwards: these are their songs collected during the centuries: here are their wise saws attributed doubtless without evidence, it makes no matter, to one of their kings: here are their hopes for the future, here their fierce denunciations of the iniquity of the present.

Get it all put into order by all means by the historians and the men of literature—get it printed like an ordinary book—and then even more than now I feel convinced that *it will find you*, that it will catch your conscience, that it will make for righteousness, as no other literature will.

And all this is just as necessary with the New Testament as with the Old. Here, more than ever, you must have, for the moment, no dealings with the theologians or the atheists.

You don't want to reconcile the four Gospels one with the other: here are some records, ancient records, at least second century records, of a unique life and of its influence from various points of view: this is what people—we really need not quarrel over their names—believed all these ages ago about Jesus Christ.

It is very interesting, though comparatively unimportant, to try and find out the sources of these four books—just as it is interesting to read the introductions supplied by the learned to Shakespeare's plays, and to know of the legends, taught about the Bible a quarter of a century ago. I hope you too will read this little book; though perhaps it may be well to remember that a Bishop is not by virtue of his office a master in Theology. But you will find all the Bishop's positive teaching about the Bible most interesting.

histories, older plays, etc., which Shakespeare worked up. But the play itself is the thing which finds us.

So it is with the four Gospels : if the critics will only tell us who did write or compile them *as they are* we shall be able to do honour to four Masters in literature, each telling a story of supreme interest and seriousness in his own simple way.

What you have to do, what all readers of the Bible as literature have to do, is to get those Gospels impressed on your mind : not to argue as to whether this or that happened, but to understand that this or that is what the writer, or, if you like, the editor of the book records as having happened. There may be details which you cannot prove to be true ; but that is no matter—you get such a general impression of the life and character of Jesus Christ and of His influence that it will live with you permanently and be the motive power of your life, and doubtless will prepare you afterwards for the theologians and dogmatists who on the ground of the common consent of the Christian society and the needs of human nature will take you much further.

Therefore in reading these books you really need not trouble whether “miracles” happen or do not happen—especially as that question is mainly a matter of words—what you have to trouble very much about is that these four reporters or their editors were fully convinced that the acts which some of them called miraculous were beneficent works of deliverance. If, as the newest scientists seem likely to maintain, most of them are unscientific accounts of works done naturally, that will be all to the good, for

Christ Himself, as your reading of the Gospels will have taught you, entirely refused to be a mere wonder-worker. Anyhow you must not say to your children—no one treating the New Testament as literature can say—because Christ did or said this or that, therefore you must do this or that: that would spoil it all: all you have to do is to tell the story, to get it read and appreciated, and let it work its own influence. The “you must do this or that” comes afterwards on the authority of the Church—the schoolmaster should keep clear of using his powers of discipline to “make the children believe.” And so, too, I would entreat my friends, the atheists and the sceptics, not to allow the fact that the Church makes certain demands on its members—to prevent them from being influenced by a most interesting literary record. It really would be cowardly not to submit yourselves to the fascination of the literature for fear lest you should so be preparing your minds for the reception of the dogma. Though really you have nothing to fear, for no dogma can last which is not founded on the essential needs of human nature. It is not because the Church decrees it that it is true: but because it is true that the Church decrees it.

You will doubtless have noticed in your commerce with your friends that at present hardly anyone reads the Bible for the enjoyment of it. It is read by some few theologians reasonably, by others to get “scripture proofs” of doctrines and catechisms, by devout people as a sacred duty: and by atheists or rationalists too often in order to gather texts from it to hurl

at Christians : if you were in ordinary conversation to begin to talk about an inspiring psalm or a magnificent prophecy, or a gospel story, you would not be looked upon merely as you would be if you spoke of Keats or Blake or Walt Whitman—as a bit of a pedant or a bore—but as either a fanatic or a crank. Few people yet realise that the Bible is the people's book—partly because you have not yet educated the children into a preliminary appreciation of literature generally, and partly because scientific studies have crowded out literature. Even those theologians who are keen about the Bible are more interested in minute verbal criticism than in any general appreciation of its legend, history and poetry.

The other day I had heard it argued as to whether the writings which once were commonly attributed to St. John were written by him or by someone else some sixty years after his death. I said it did not matter, that they were at any rate very ancient, at least pre-reformation—for I always have my dissenting friends in mind—and very interesting: I think the company thought me flippant. I went the next Sunday to Mass and heard the priest proclaim these words "God is love and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God and God in him."

Now it is an interesting antiquarian matter to know when and by whom those words were uttered—but any way there they are, echoing down the ages, getting themselves attended to in the Thames Valley in 1903. And that is the main thing: someone, somewhere or other, at some time or other made that suggestion, others have made all sorts of other suggestions—but this little bit of literature enshrines that—it is

surely priceless. It is very simple—obvious, perhaps, when you see it—but in the world of thought to many revolutionary and liberating. There are so many other and contrary qualities which might have been, which have been, attributed to God : we will make much of the author, compiler, editor, whatever his name or whatever his date, who made this suggestion. But even this you must not try to force on your children : it would never do to say you *must* believe that God is love or else you will be punished : that would spoil it all : but the literary student of the Bible comes upon it : it strikes him : it seems to meet his best nature : it finds him. And remember, that if this, or any other beautiful thought he comes upon, does not *find him* (that is Coleridge's classical phrase) it will do him no good, but indeed an infinitude of harm to have it forced upon him. Let him alone, it will probably find him by and bye. The theologian and ecclesiastic need not be afraid : the Bible left to itself leads inevitably to the Catholic Church.

And perhaps that is the reason why there are those who want to get rid of the Bible out of the schools altogether. They are afraid of it : they would like to confine it to the Church, to whose teaching so small a proportion of the London population seem to pay much heed : to make it a book for the pious and religious instead of for the common people. To any such compulsory exclusion of the Bible from our common schools, I, as for years an advocate of secular education, can never consent. Get rid, by all means, of religious dogma out of our schools, get rid of a code of morals founded upon a collection of Bible texts—get rid of the rule which says that the

principles of the Christian religion—the average creed of Englishmen, the bases of belief—are to be taught. But do not allow your scholastic calling to be degraded by your being forbidden to use parts of this great literature in the course of your children's education.

I hope that the people at the coming elections will insist on their rights in this matter: I hope there is a sufficient "Remnant" of them who read the Bible rationally and who want their children to be taught to read it rationally to deliver us alike from the religious friends and the atheistic foes of the Bible—both of whom misuse it fatally. Now that we have a large number of voters who have passed through your hands it will be an excellent test as to whether you have taught them the Bible so as to make them appreciate it.

It is the fault of those of you who voted in this Government that this question cannot be decided without running the risk of damaging much of the good material work which has been going forward in London under the County Council.

I am sorry indeed for the candidates for the Boroughs and County having these unfamiliar matters brought before them for their decision: their lighting and their libraries, their drains and their open spaces, their music halls and their "settled temperance policy," and the hundred and one other matters with which they have so vigorously concerned themselves—in most respects so largely for the people's good—these, I fear, owing to the foolish action of the government in giving way to the bishops and the bureaucrats, will no longer take the first place in the contests: what will take the first place

will be questions as to whether the rates shall be spent on Church schools, and whether the priest shall be allowed to teach in them: whether (as I again remind you, can easily be done under the Cowper Temple clause) dogmas and doctrines shall be enforced on the children in the old Board schools by means of the secular arm: whether the Bible shall be entirely excluded from the schools or whether classical portions of it shall be read and explained as literature—these are the questions on which these good men will have to make up their minds.

I do not venture to foretell what their decision may be: but I fear that it is quite possible that it may be for the excluding of the Bible altogether—it would save so much trouble and friction: that, in my opinion would be a serious blow to secular education, and a dangerous concession to priests and ministers, who already with their dogmas and doctrines and sacraments are in an impregnable position, provided they keep them and themselves outside the schools and deal with them in the living Christian society which alone can make them vital.

But if this disaster happens we must keep our heads, and above all avoid one most dangerous argument. It has often been said that if you exclude the Bible you will banish God from the schools. A more blasphemous statement it is impossible to imagine. Surely God dwelleth not between covers made with hands any more than in temples made with hands: He is inspiring you who teach and your children who learn—not only from 9.5 to 9.45 each morning (except Saturday), but throughout the day and every day, even on Sunday. Let me

advise you in this connection to read an excellent statement made by my friend, Thomas Hancock, fifteen years ago, when I issued my first School Board address to the people of Bethnal Green—entitled “God as our school-master is always in all schools.”

“Banish God from the schools!” The exclusion of the most inspiring of all literatures, the exclusion of the children’s best introduction to humane learning, would indeed be a disaster, but it would not be quite such a catastrophe as that!

I believe the solution of this question rests to a large degree—even now—with you teachers. The Councillors will, we may presume, want to inform their minds before taking action, what more natural then than that they should come and hear a few Bible lessons; I am convinced that in many cases they would be delighted: that the follies so brilliantly satirised by Mr. Marson in his little *brochure* on the Bible teaching in Church schools, with the startling title *Huppin and Muppin*, will be finding no place with you, and that most of you will not be found doing as you have been slanderously reported to be doing—“treating as solemn fact every Hebrew legend and impossible miracle.” But I tremble for some of you.

You will remember that Mr. Coxhead started the religious controversy which gave us so much trouble some years ago (and which Mr. Riley so well engineered for his own purposes, now victoriously accomplished by the destruction of the School Board) by telling us how he had discovered a Unitarian baby in the Whitfield Street Board School. The poor little child had been entrapt into saying something which seemed (to Mr.

Coxhead) to deny the Virgin birth of our Lord. But now with this and all the other doctrines of the Christian Church you have absolutely no right to deal at all. To take a crucial point; you come upon the story of the Raising of Lazarus, or greatest of all, you read of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ: it is not here your business either to affirm or to deny, but to let the story as recorded tell itself: to let your children know that this is what the various writers reported. That is enough—leave it there, let it germinate in the child's mind for what it is worth. You are not dealing with the Church's Creed, for that indeed does not depend on the Bible story, as the Church believed in the Resurrection, and acted on that belief long before the Gospels were written: and it is indeed part of your business *incidentally*, by the mere fact of treating the Bible as what it is, to discredit the popular notions that the Christian religion is founded on a book: but all you have to do directly, is to get the children interested and fascinated with the Gospel story, not to dogmatise about it.

You will deal in the same way with the Old Testament stories, you will not be perpetually drawing moral lessons from them—the way in which your little prigs preach in their answers to the examination questions is too terrible—but you will leave the stories to carry their own influence: explaining the meaning of the words and the structure of the sentences, but abstaining from sermonising. Mr. Gould, whose little book I have recommended to you, is a great sinner in this matter. He wants, indeed, to formulate a regular code of ethics for your children, that too is a job which your County Council will be asked

to tackle. But meanwhile, in dealing with Deborah's song, which it seems is the oldest bit of the Bible, Mr. Gould thinks it necessary to call it "brutal": he might just as well have pointed out when reading the story of David and Goliath that though David won, still it was naughty for boys to throw stones. You spoil the whole thing, with children at any rate, if you keep perpetually drawing moral lessons. The moral lessons must be allowed to insinuate themselves: the story must be allowed to catch the conscience: you have plenty of other opportunities to exercise your authority. So also you spoil the legends if you keep on saying, remember it is not true: you make your children think that fiction and falsehood are identical.

But further, when you come to the beautiful classical pieces from the Psalms or the Prophets you will take care, as notwithstanding what I have said, I have found that a great many of you do, when your children are learning great pieces from Shakespeare or Wordsworth or Coleridge or Grey, not only that they understand and value the diction, but that they feel and appreciate the movement. If, as has been said, the highest literature is distinguished by the truth and seriousness of its matter and substance as well as by diction and movement in its style and manner—then indeed you have in these selections from the Hebrew poets and prophets something quite incomparable. Let me illustrate: as I am writing this I come to the ninth day of the month and I go to church to sing "Matins," a luxury I seldom indulge in. What do I hear? A grand Hebrew national hymn full of a healthy sort of patriotism; a unique marriage song, an epithalamium with which Spenser's and

Ben Jonson's may well stand comparison; and the "*Deus noster refugium*," which has been the inspiration and the consolation of thousands throughout the ages. That is the kind of inspiring classical Hebrew poetry with which you have to deal in our schools, and with which you can rightly deal: that your children should not leave school without knowing such valuable stuff by heart, without feeling a little the beauty and excitement of it is, indeed, all to the good: it would be a thousand pities to deprive them of these lessons.

And in this connection if you will allow me, I cannot help thinking of my own Eton school days and of what I owe to constantly hearing that Hebrew poetry, and the anthems founded on it, so magnificently sung by the St. George's Choir. That was not, of course, definite Church teaching: that I got, more or less, when I was prepared for confirmation—but it was valuable educational work.

Now if this is what you are doing, or something like this, I think it will be very difficult for your new masters, with their minds preoccupied with other matters to interfere with you.

The danger, however, will be from those who are jealous of this time specially devoted to literature, who want that first hour for more arithmetic and spelling: these things to some people are the main factors of elementary education—their results are so easily tabulated. And then there are always the grim ministers of technical education, urged on by those who want cheap but clever "wage-slaves," holding up an American or German bogey to terrify us into beginning the children's technical training before they know anything

of the Liberal arts. Now, of course, you know quite well that the Hebrew literature will not tend towards the creation of a race of obedient one-eyed specialists, warranted to be duly subservient to the Captains of Industry, when at last they are turned out from our coming English Charlottenburg; but you also know that there is no literature so likely to encourage in our Londoners a sense of citizenship as the Hebrew literature, and that the forty minutes spent on the study of it is well spent from the point of view of those who want our children to grow up, not merely as excellent competitors in the race of English commerce against the commerce of Germany or America, but as intelligent, independent human beings with citizen rights and citizen duties. As I have often said to the pupils of the Evening Classes: "Born a man and died a grocer" is not an enviable epitaph: by all means let the grocer attend to his grocery, and the engineer to his engineering, and so on: but let them also not forget that they are men and citizens—and it is just this which the Hebrew Scriptures pre-eminently will not let them forget.

But now I have to remind you that the rule of the dying School Board forbids you to attempt to attach any child to any denomination. I have never been quite able to make out what that word means, or that uglier word denominationalism, for which so many good men are contending.

But I believe the rule includes this much: that you must not use your influence to get the children entrusted to your care as schoolmasters

baptised into the Catholic Church : and with that I entirely agree ; for that, important as it is, is not your business. Whether it also means that you must not get them to join a Band of Hope I am not quite sure ; perhaps there is something “ basal ” and “ average ” about a Band of Hope which there is not about Baptism or the Catholic Church.

But that it is somebody's business to get all the children to become members of the great Christian Society I have no manner of doubt. I could not have said what I have said about the Bible as literature, and your duty as teachers of the Commonwealth in the common schools to deal with it as such, unless I had been equally convinced of the duty and the power of the Church to claim every baby born into the world as having a right in virtue of its babyhood to be made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven. But I repeat, this is none of your business. No one can value your work more than I do : but to teach about the two sacraments everywhere necessary for salvation, and about the other five sacraments, is not in your province. The clergy after all must have something to do : if they would only do their work and leave you unhindered to do yours, all would be well.

But however much they may refuse to do it, however much they may confine their religious instruction to the few who attend their Church schools, instead of giving it to all the children in their parishes at the time and in the place appointed for them, you must not on that account attempt it. “ Foul fall the day,” said Mr. Gladstone, “ when the men of this world shall take into their uncommissioned hands the duty of

manipulating the Christian religion": with this I entirely agree. And yet when in a conversation some years ago with Archbishop Benson, I spoke of the duty of the clergy in London to teach to all the children in their parishes, the principles of the Catholic Faith, he said, "the best of the clergy are too busy, the others are too lazy."

It may be so—but still, even then, it is not your duty to attempt to take their place. Many of you I know are veritable gluttons for work; in many neighbourhoods you are, and have been for years, in the literal sense of the word, perfect godsenders both to the children and their parents: and I earnestly wish that some of you who have been with us from the beginning would, for the benefit of future historians, write a candid account of what you have heard and seen and done. But still even though it may be said that you have done a missionary work, it is not for you as teachers in the common or State schools to deal with the sacraments and doctrines of the Church.

Whose business is it and how is it to be done? The new minute of the Board of Education makes it possible for the education authority to give "Facilities without," to enable parents to withdraw their children from school between 9 and 9.45, and so to send them to receive what religious instruction they can get from ministers of religion: but it also enables the children to stay in bed, or to help mother or to go on errands or to play about in the streets, during that time, and one of the many interesting subjects which our friends of the L.C.C. will have to decide in a few months is whether they will put this minute into force in London. "Facilities within" are also being

discussed again, by which ministers of religion, or others deputed by them, can gather into the various class-rooms, each of them, all the children in the various standards, in so far as they have been entrusted to them by their parents. Poor ministers! they are not always good disciplinarians, but a class of children of all standards would puzzle even some of *you*. And so a further suggestion is, that there should be what I believe Nonconformists call a "credal" register kept, both of you and of the children, and that you each, with a mission from your "denomination," should give instruction to the children of that denomination in the principles of its religion; in which case I suppose you would be paid by the denomination a forty-five minutes' worth of your salary—and for that period be under the denomination's control.

I wonder whether any of these plans would work well. However, the arrangement for these things will not be in my hands, but in the hands of those gentlemen—no women admitted—who have hitherto done so well by you in the matter of drains and open spaces.

But what I want to urge is, that whether any or all of these plans are adopted, there would still equally, indeed to a greater degree, be left to you the duty of teaching the Bible—of dealing with classical portions of the great Hebrew literature in the course of secular education. I say to a greater degree, because, as many of you know, in the case of the Nonconformists, and as Mr. Marson has shewn us, in the case of the Church schools also, it is still the custom to ground the dogmas and doctrines on the authority of the Bible instead of on the authority of the Church: and that is just what is so

damaging to the Bible; that from which you as secular teachers have to save the Bible. Soon, by the way, it will be found that it is equally damaging to the Catholic Faith: as I found out a quarter of a century ago when, as a curate in Bethnal Green, I used to frequent the Hall of Science; and as the readers of *The Clarion* and of some of the publications of the Rationalist Press have been finding out during the present year. But this is another question.

I wonder whether, if any of the proposed plans were adopted, the County Council would still retain the rule forbidding you to attempt to attach your children to any denomination. One over-zealous teacher the other day got one of her school children baptised while the child was dangerously ill in the small-pox hospital. She serves us no longer. We have, as I have already suggested, not been so strict about other ceremonies. But the rule is quite right. Kidnapping is a poor game to play, whether it is kidnapping for the Church or for teetotalism; and you should be above the tricks of the rival Sunday school managers, who receive children just as they come, without the written or personal authority of their parents, and without knowing whether they are on the roll of any other Sunday school. It is said that these rolls increase for a few weeks before the summer and winter treats.

But while our rule is an excellent one, the experience of those of you, and they are many, who know the home life and the future careers of your children, will have taught you that if there is one thing more than another that is important for the well-being of a child, it is that he should early begin to find himself the member of

some religious society, or at any rate of some society earnest about life and conduct. That is the real value of the Sunday school. I believe, to put it mildly, that the teaching given in most Sunday schools is often very poor. I remember to my dismay, that at my first school I was set, before I was fourteen, to teach in the village Sunday school—poor Wadhurst boys, I ask your pardon; and I have often seen charming young girls who ought to have been learning the Church catechism, on the way to teach it: but though the teaching in most Sunday schools can only be assessed “fair,” the schools need not on that account be “warned” or closed, because the relationship between teacher and child is so often of inestimable, permanent value. For the Sunday school is rightly and legitimately “a school with two doors.” If therefore the parish priest does his work the few simple principles and practices of the Christian Faith, which are all that is essential for a child to learn, can easily be taught in church: they are so few and so simple. They only become elaborate and complicated when an attempt is made to prove them to the poor child from the Bible. That indeed is a big job—the work of a lifetime: and the knowledge of the somewhat confused and unedited condition in which the Bible is at present issued, does not make it an easier job. Fortunately it is a job which children need not attempt and should not, in charity, be led to attempt.

This is my answer to my brethren of the clergy, if any of them should honour me by reading this paper, when they say that unless the principles of the Catholic Faith are taught in the State schools to the children, regimented

for the purpose by the State, they never will be taught at all to many of them.

For shame, my reverend brethren ! what are you ordained for ? I will add, though it sounds harsh, what are you paid for ? Can it be that “you are too busy or too lazy” ?—there are a multitude of businesses, then, which you ought to postpone for this most urgent business : that you are too lazy is certainly not my experience, but at any rate the least industrious of you will not find this work too hard. For I say, without fear of contradiction, that the principles and practices of the Catholic Faith to be taught to the children are very few and very simple.

I believe, however, that the clergy have one legitimate ground of complaint against you : it has not been made sufficiently clear in how literary and in how undogmatic a way you deal with the Bible in your schools, and so, the popular notion still lingering that the Bible is our religion, it has come to be believed that the claims of religion are satisfied by your Bible lesson. For this the clergy themselves are of course largely to blame : but now that they are beginning to see their mistake it should make them cordial supporters of the object which this essay has in view, *viz.*, making clear the distinction between the value of the Bible as literature and the Church as the promulgator of dogma, between the function of the schoolmaster and the function of the priest.

Though, therefore, you are forbidden to attach your children to any denomination, you probably know better than most the importance of that attachment, and would be the first to be glad to see the Church alive to its duty in the matter, both because the Church can teach

the children the principles of the Christian religion, which notwithstanding our unfortunate rule you cannot teach them and do not attempt to teach : and because the Church being a living society, into which every little child has a right to be admitted on the ground of its humanity, you would be sure that when the Church did its work each child would find himself surrounded by those who would help and encourage him in leading a good life. He would not only be instructed in the simple elements of the Catholic Faith and practice, but also have some one to stimulate him to right conduct and to help him to pick himself up when he falls.

This, and much more that I have said, is written in order to impress upon you that you must not think that you are the only educators whom the child has to do with : to remind you that the State need not trench on the province of the Church. You are indeed one of his spiritual pastors but you are not his parish priest.

It is interesting to remember that Mr. Huxley was largely instrumental in getting the resolution carried by the first Board under which the Bible is read in the schools. I have always maintained that that resolution was badly worded : I think it would have been better if it had run "that selections from the Bible shall be read and simply explained" ; that indeed is what the resolution has generally resulted in. But, though the rule as originally passed and as altered is a bad one, we have to be grateful to Mr. Huxley for using his influence to get the Bible into the schools at all.

This contribution of his towards a literary education for our people may be taken to counter-balance the piles of advanced and other sciences with which your "Forms 40" are now encumbered. How delightful it would be, if a full knowledge of Shakespeare's plays could be taken as an equivalent to half a dozen sciences: and how much more humanising.

But I want to impress on those of you who make much of your sciences, that Mr. Huxley was intensely interested in the Bible. In the sixpenny edition of his Lectures, which sells by thousands, five out of seven deal, more or less, with the Bible, only two with science. This perhaps is out of proportion: for he was an acknowledged master in science and our debt to him there is incalculable: but much of what he says about the Bible is already out of date. And the way in which he treats it is an excellent illustration of the way in which you had better not treat it. He gets hold of one or two apparently unscientific statements and worries them. For instance, he evidently had got the story of the Gadarean swine on his brain: he keeps constantly referring to it: and when Dr. Wace and Mr. Gladstone defended it, he seems to confuse Dr. Wace and Mr. Gladstone with the Church of England, which as far as I know has made no official pronouncement on the subject. I at any rate utterly refuse to admit that my loyalty to Christ and my acceptance of the Catholic Faith depend in any way on the question whether those pigs went mad at all, or whether they went mad under the conditions reported.

But then, and this is of the utmost importance, and touches the heart of your Bible teaching, Mr. Huxley says he can't discover

the difference between believing a person and believing *in* a person.

Suppose, then, the woman whom you trust, whom you have faith in, to whom you are loyal and devoted, tells you that something has happened which you know has not happened—she has made a mistake owing to ignorance of some scientific facts in connection with the matter she was describing—are you forsooth on account of that mistake to have faith in her, be loyal to her, no longer? You believe in her though you don't believe her.

Or to put it in another way and to connect it with a matter I was so keen about before you teachers engrossed so much of my time and to which when I am turned out of Bethnal Green on the 1st of next May I may be able to attend again: suppose Mr. Huxley had been to see a ballet at the Alhambra and in describing the steps had confused a *ballonné* with an *entrechat*. Am I, because I know him to be wrong, because I don't believe him, on a matter of technique on which he happens to be ignorant, to say that I can have no more confidence in him: that all his scientific teaching is under a cloud, discredited?

The thing is absurd: belief in the accuracy of a statement is absolutely different from trust or faith in a person.

Now this consideration is essential to your Bible reading, especially to your reading in the Gospels. You may come across statements which you may think, or your pupils may think, inaccurate: the little chaps, doubtless, will be delighted to set the Reporters right about them—as I believe, with your excellent drawing lessons, many of your pupils could point out errors in Giotto's perspective—but these things

really don't matter: what does matter is this—that if you have read the Gospels properly, intelligently and reverently, as you would read Shakespeare or Wordsworth, or Shelley or Keats or Blake: then your children cannot fail to have their faith in Jesus Christ, their trust in Him, their loyalty and devotion to Him, called forth. If you attempt to go beyond your province, if you say you must believe this, or you must believe that, then I again say, you spoil it all: but if you adopt the literary method, then the story will have its own benign influence upon them. They may not believe, and you must not try to force them to believe, all that is written, but they will have the germs of faith in Christ, enthusiasm for His life and character, implanted in them.

Our people are suffering because they do not make much of the best literature, because they do not allow themselves to get saturated with what the best people have thought and said and done in the past.

It would surely be foolish at such a time to deprive our children of the use of the Bible in our schools or to prevent them from getting there a knowledge of the story of Christ.

This of course will not avail to make them Christians, and cannot take the place of their instruction in the Catholic Faith. But it is a fine piece of educational work, and I hope that you may be allowed to continue it.

I have spoken to you frankly and freely because I feel that I am writing to personal friends. But you would hardly consider this

letter authentic unless there was some reference in it to Evening Schools. Let me therefore tell you that our Literature Classes will be found to be valuable not only for your pupils when they leave you: but that some of the classes, which we hope during the coming session to bring into touch with Dr. Roberts' work in connection with the London University, might be of value to you as teachers.

Wishing you well under your new masters,

I am, yours faithfully,

STEWART D. HEADLAM.

THE following are the books to which I venture to ask the attention of those of you who have not already mastered them.

“Literature and Dogma.” By MATTHEW ARNOLD. Watts & Co. 6*d*.

“The Great Prophecy of Israel’s Restoration.” By MATTHEW ARNOLD. Macmillan. 1*s*.

“The Patriarchs and Lawgivers of the Old Testament.” By F. D. MAURICE. Macmillan. 5*s*.

“The Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament.” By F. D. MAURICE. Macmillan. 6*s*.

“The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven.” By F. D. MAURICE. Macmillan. 9*s*.

“The Building of the Bible.” By F. J. GOULD. Watts & Co. 3*d*.

“The Laws of Eternal Life”: Studies in the Church Catechism. By STEWART D. HEADLAM. Verinder, 376, Strand. 6*d*.

“God as our Schoolmaster.” By THOMAS HANCOCK. Verinder, 376, Strand. 1*d*.

“Huppim and Muppim.” By CHARLES L. MARSON. A. R. Mowbray & Co. 1*d*.

“An Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures.” By THE LORD BISHOP OF RIPON. J. M. Dent & Co. 1*s*.

Light in the Light of God

A SERMON

PREACHED IN

*THE CHURCH OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW
BRIGHTON*

BEFORE THE BRIGHTON AND MID-SUSSEX DISTRICT
ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

ON MARCH 19, 1896

BY

DARWELL STONE, M.A.

PRINCIPAL OF THE MISSIONARY COLLEGE, DORCHESTER

WITH

A PREFACE ON THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM

Published by Request

RIVINGTON, PERCIVAL & CO.

KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN

LONDON

1896

PREFACE

THE sermon which the following pages contain was preached at the invitation of the Brighton and Mid-Sussex District English Church Union. In assenting to the kind request which has been made by some whose opinion he is bound to respect, the preacher is too conscious of the slight treatment which the sermon gives to a great subject, to feel justified in allowing its publication without prefixing a brief statement which may tend to emphasize needs the sense of which has no doubt led to the wish to which he has referred.¹

It is impossible to deny the wide extent of indifference among the English people to the separation of the Church in England from the Church elsewhere. Whether the chief cause is to be found in certain features of the character of the race or in the past history of the nation, the fact is clear. Our isolation in this matter is little realized, and where it is realized frequently gives no pain.

Yet it might have been anticipated that a sober-minded people would be alive to the practical disadvantages of

¹ The sermon was not written before delivery; but, on the expression of a wish for its publication, it was written out immediately afterwards, and the preacher is confident that what is now printed gives almost everywhere verbally and everywhere substantially what he said.

the present state of the Church. From almost any point of view, isolation and division mean weakness. To say nothing of any spiritual loss to travellers abroad, our visible separation from Rome hampers in many ways Christian efforts in England. The force of the claim which the Church makes for episcopacy and the sacramental system is impaired. The onslaught upon vice and the alleviation of suffering are weakened and hindered. The waste of power in foreign missionary work in the present, and the dangers which are likely to arise in growing Christian communities in the future, are obvious enough. And just at this moment, in England itself, the question of elementary education is supplying a sufficient illustration of the fact that to have been deprived of visible unity is to have lost, to a considerable extent, the power for effective action.

But there are considerations which, to the mind of a Christian, are of even higher importance than any which spring from a practical view of existing needs. When the terms in which the Church is spoken of in Holy Scripture are borne in mind, and the design of our Lord Himself is sufficiently remembered, visible separations are to be deplored, not merely because of the inconvenience and weakness which they produce, but because they are in themselves offences against God. It is true, of course, that the unity of the Church, which depends upon union by covenanted means with the one life of Christ, is inward, and cannot be destroyed by anything external which is compatible with the existence of those means. But if the Church is truly described as the Body¹ and the Bride² of Christ, if she is the Temple³ in which the Divine Spirit

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 27; Eph. i. 22, 23.

² Eph. v. 23-32.

³ Eph. ii. 19-22.

dwells, and the family¹ and household² of which God is the Father and Lord, if she forms a kingdom³ of which her Redeemer is the King, it follows that her outward divisions bear no small resemblance to those wounds with which her Founder Himself was pierced upon the cross.

It may be that some whose serious Churchmanship and devotion to our Lord would naturally lead them to take to heart the divided condition of Christendom are inclined to despair of any change being brought about, because obstacles which seem to them insuperable are prominently in their thoughts. Certainly, no one can deny the terrible character of the obstacles. It would be futile, even if it were not wrong, to make light of the hindrances to visible unity which are only too plain in the Churches of the East, in the Church of Rome, and among ourselves. Indeed, these are so great and so deep-seated that, if the present writer is to express his own opinion, a reunion which should come quickly could only come on grounds so imperfect, and on a basis so insecure, that it would be productive of harm, and would not be lasting. But what sensible man gives up a project which he knows to be right, because the difficulties in the way of attaining it seem to him gigantic, or because he recognizes that if the work is to be done well, it will have to be done slowly? The one question in the matter under consideration is whether we can honestly believe that our present divisions are in accordance with the Will of God. If Revelation itself forbids us so to think, then, by the side of our recognition of tremendous barriers, we need to recall the Divine teaching that "with God all things are possible."⁴

¹ Eph. iii. 15.

² St. Matt. xxiv. 45-51, xxv. 14-30; St. Luke xix. 12-27.

³ *E.g.* St. Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17, x. 7, xiii. 24.

⁴ St. Matt. xix. 26.

The frank acknowledgment of difficulty is not a call to inaction. And it may be well to consider what is the temper of mind in which we English Church-people ought to be approaching the problem. Perhaps the first need is the cultivation of the spirit of penitence. The providence of God has preserved to us all that is actually necessary for the maintenance of Church life. We are committed to belief in the historical Creeds of Christendom; that our Sacraments are valid can only be denied by a process of reasoning which might cast doubt on the existence of covenanted grace in any part of the Church. If there are sad passages in our history, of apathy, of compromise, of a low level of life, of personal unbelief, there are not wanting parallels elsewhere in the West and in the East; and the most illustrious of Churches must needs plead guilty to the failure of Liberius, and the heresy of Honorius, and the dreadful wickedness of the Tusculan Popes. Yet, if the study of history tells us that we may rest secure in our possession of Church life, it tells us also that our great need is in penitence to be making reparation to Almighty God for the dishonour which has been done, and is being done among us, to His Name. Each of the different centuries of our separated history has its own list of faults and mistakes. Parts of the sixteenth century were marked by a reckless disregard of historical principles which for a time threatened to endanger our Catholic heritage. The seventeenth century was full of subservience to the world. The deadness of the eighteenth century has passed into a proverb. And at the present time the various forms of error, the numerous imperfections in the use of the means of grace, the moral standard of too many even of those who claim the position of Church-people, added to the unbelief and ignorance and sin of those whom

the Church has lost, supply ground enough for heartfelt humiliation. It is often painful to read the self-satisfied words of English writers, who apparently forget that the surest basis of thankfulness for all that the Church in England has continued to be and do is to be found in penitence for what has been wrongly done or left undone. There is nothing to be gained by shutting our eyes to distressing facts among Christians anywhere, but we have Divine authority for believing that in such a matter our first concern is with ourselves.¹

A necessity of a different kind is to recognize the tendency of some Roman Catholics to accept a more moderate interpretation of the papal claims than that which has become most familiar to many in England. It is very significant that a theologian of the eminence of M. Boudinhon² should markedly abstain from pressing the opinion that the Pope is the necessary channel of Episcopal jurisdiction, and should content himself with the theory that the jurisdiction of the Bishops cannot be rightfully exercised except in communion with the See of Rome; and that another writer, dealing specifically with English matters, should expressly state that the former of these views is nothing more than a tenable opinion.³ It is impossible, of course, that English Church-people should accept any theory which makes the Pope the necessary centre of the unity that is, in turn, necessary to Church life; but it

¹ St. Matt. vii. 1-5.

² See *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, Dec. 7, 1895, pp. 10-23. Cf. the same *Revue*, Jan. 25, 1896, pp. 348-357. It may perhaps be regarded as one of the proverbial "straws" which are indications of what is not unimportant that this sermon should be allowed, by the kindness of their respective editors, to appear in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* and in the *English Church Union Gazette*.

³ Raguey, *La Crise Religieuse en Angleterre*, p. 201.

is obvious that such a view as M. Boudinhon appears to hold affords a much more hopeful prospect of eventual agreement, without any compromise on the one side of the rightful position of the Bishop of Rome, and on the other side of what English Church-people regard as the historical powers inherent in the Episcopal office, than the opinion of which he speaks in somewhat slighting terms. And, so far as there is a tendency to minimize any personal element in the Infallibility decree of the Vatican Council of 1870, there is more hope of a similar agreement among those who are prepared to acknowledge the infallibility of the Œcumenical decisions of the Church, than when such an interpretation of the decree as that which has been associated with the distinguished name of Cardinal Manning¹ is prominent. It may be said that it is easy to exaggerate the significance of either of these two points. However that may be, there is ground for hope in at least this, that they afford an indication of a desire on the part of some Roman Catholics to give serious and not unappreciative consideration to genuine objections felt by those who are not Roman Catholics to distinctively Roman doctrines.

When, then, we are approaching the problem with a readiness to acknowledge what is faulty in ourselves and to welcome what is hopeful in others, we are entitled to lay the strongest stress on our claim to our possession of a share in the inheritance of Catholic Christians, and on our conviction that submission to the present demands of Rome cannot rightly be required of us on the ground of Scriptural or Œcumenical authority. The real need on every side is the clear recognition of gifts and virtues, and the honest acknowledgment of faults and blunders.²

¹ Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, ii. 456.

² It may be worth while in this connection to refer to a striking passage

The hope of reunion is wider than that of the outward unity of the Church in the West. We are, indeed, Western in our history and in our thought and in our methods. It is to the great See of the West that we must first stretch out our efforts towards joining together what for centuries has been divided. But the hope itself will find in Western unity only a standpoint for further work, and will not be fulfilled till the East and the West are once more linked in the friendship and communion that should mark the common possessors of the Christian faith.

While it was the earnest desire of the preacher of the following sermon to suggest thoughts which might furnish some ray of comfort to those already keenly alive to the weakness of our present state, his main object was to do what little he could to arouse or to maintain such a wish for visible unity as finds expression in prayer to God. And he may be permitted to say that it is surely want of faith which uses the word "hopeless" to describe a cause that is thus committed to the Divine power and grace; and that it is an earnest of future, if far-distant, triumph that English prayers should be offered "for the Catholic Church, its establishment and increase; for the Eastern, its deliverance and union; for the Western, its adjustment and peace; for the British, the supply of what is wanting in it, the strengthening of what remains in it,"¹ and that certainly at some foreign altars a new meaning is attached to the daily recitation of the ancient words, "Pro Ecclesia tua

in Möhler, *Symbolism*, § 37: "This is the point at which Catholics and Protestants will, in great multitudes, one day meet and stretch out a friendly hand one to the other. Both, conscious of guilt, must exclaim, 'We all have erred—it is the Church only which cannot err; we all have sinned—the Church only is spotless on earth.' This open confession of mutual guilt will be followed by the festival of reconciliation."

¹ *Bishop Andrewes's Devotions*, Prayers for the second day.

sancta catholica : quam pacificare, custodire, adunare, et regere digneris toto orbe terrarum.”¹

“Rogate quæ ad pacem sunt Jerusalem : et abundantia diligentibus te.”■

DARWELL STONE.

¹ Canon Missæ.

² Ps. cxxii. 6.

LIGHT IN THE LIGHT OF GOD

“In Thy light shall we see light.”—PSALM xxxvi. 9.

IN this Psalm the Psalmist begins with the thought of the iniquity of the wicked man. He goes on to contemplate the mercy and faithfulness and righteousness and judgments of Almighty God. And before he prays for the continuance of the lovingkindness and righteousness and protection of the Most High, he exclaims with a kind of outburst how rich is the bounty of God to those who put their trust under the shadow of His wings. “They shall be abundantly satisfied with the fatness of Thy house; and Thou shalt make them drink of the river of Thy pleasures. For with Thee is the fountain of life: in Thy light shall we see light.”

“In Thy light shall we see light.” It is one of the great needs of man to have knowledge of God, His Nature, His laws, His Providence; to have knowledge of himself, who he is, whence he comes, what he ought to do, whither he is going. As it is a need of man, so is it a gift which God most richly has bestowed. We may trace it out through the whole course of the inspired record. To the patriarchs He gave the knowledge of His Being and Will, of their creation in His image, their duty, their destiny. To Moses and the people of Israel He gave light in His great

deliverance, His miraculous works, even in the terrors of Sinai. To the prophets, in all their stern denunciations there was the light of the law of God and the duty of man. A fuller light came in the Incarnation, when the true Light in the Person of God the Son was made Man for us men and for our salvation. Nor did the light cease with His Ascension. The Holy Ghost, Who inspired the Apostles, Who was the real guide in the great Councils of the Church, Who moved the thoughts of one writer here and another writer there, still shed light into the hearts of men. And among ourselves to-day, the illuminated conscience of the baptized Christian tells him how he may apply the laws of God to the details of his daily life.

But mark the condition which in each case has been necessary if the light of God was to be received. The condition was faithful obedience to the commands of the Most High. Abraham had to leave his home and go out, not knowing whither he went. Moses had to return from the home he had made in Midian to the country where they had sought his life. The people of Israel had to journey into the great and terrible wilderness. The prophets had to pass through stern ordeals. The Apostles must leave all and follow Christ. St. Paul must bow his neck under the yoke of Him Whom a moment before he was persecuting, and say, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" And do we not know that the light of God is most fully in our souls when by Divine grace we are uprooting self-indulgence and self-will?

We are living in days of perplexity and sadness. We look on the divisions of the Church, and we are sad. We look forward to the future, and we are perplexed. We look back to the past, and again we are filled with sorrow. From one point of view, indeed, the Church is terrible as

an army with banners, fair even now as the Bride of Christ ; but from another point of view her history has its dark blots in every part. We look to the East, and we see how great Churches have yielded to the State, with this as one result, that they have surrendered a part of the law of Christian marriage.¹ We look to the Church of Rome, and we see in her splendid history that there have been times when a tyrannical and despotic spirit made the great See which was designed to be the centre of unity into a source of disunion. We turn to ourselves, and if we need to thank God for all He has given and preserved to us, we need also to be filled with shame and sorrow, to fall on our knees in bitter penitence for our misdeeds. And yet, as we see cause enough for perplexity and sorrow, we are not without hope in our knowledge of the providence of God and the power of grace.

But we mark again that the light comes to those who are faithful in obedience to the commands of God ; and we ask what form our obedience must take in such a matter as this. There is something lacking in the faithfulness of obedience to God where there is not loyalty to the facts of history and life. And there are two things which loyalty to the facts of history absolutely forbids. In the first place, it forbids us to take any step which may imply a denial of the reality of the sacramental means of grace in the Church of England. The Church of God is one Body, of which we are a true part, and the claim that our visible separation from Rome invalidates our sacramental life and involves the duty of secession, is a claim which simply will not bear to be looked at in the light of history, and in the light of the doctrine of the Church taught by the great fathers.

¹ See appended note on page 17.

And, in the second place, it absolutely forbids Catholic Church-people to acquiesce and rest and be contented in the present divided state of the Church, in our isolation and our consequent weakness. For in the light of the facts of history and of the New Testament we cannot regard our divisions as being truly of the mind of Christ.

Faithful obedience, again, leads to the acceptance of all truth taught by the whole Church. It is not because doctrines are congenial to our minds, or because they help us, that it is our duty to accept them, but because as the teaching of God Himself they come to us with a clear and imperative claim.

Our obedience must be found in the faithful performance of all which the whole Church commands in the way of practice. And here, perhaps, most of all may individual Christians help on the great work. As you keep the ordinary laws of the Church in simple and commonplace ways, as you are careful to regard times of fast and festival, and to pay attention to the laws for the use of the Sacraments which have universal sanction—things familiar to all of you, things carefully guarded, I trust, by all of you—you seem to yourselves to be doing but little; in reality, you are not only helping your own souls, you are doing no small work towards the restoration of the outward unity of the Church of Christ.

And you must pray the prayer of submission, "Thy Will be done." If we recognize that our Divine Lord Himself prayed that the unity of His Church might be so complete that it could be compared with the unity of the Life of God, we must recognize also that times are in His hand. Whether the great day of restored outward unity is to come in our own lives, or in the lives of our children, or in the lives of their descendants, matters little.

What does matter is whether we are hoping and praying, and, if God so call us, working for it, and submitting ourselves so wholly to the Lord that we are able to say, in the words of inspired prayer, "Show Thy servants Thy work, and their children Thy glory."

And whether or no we see it on this earth with our bodily eyes, we shall behold it in its perfection in the eternal unity of the future life.

Our hearts ache as we think of the divisions of the Church, which are the wounds of the Body of Christ. Our hearts ache as we think of the misunderstandings which make the wounds deeper, and the want of charity which makes them more sore. Yet, as our hearts are almost breaking, because the sorrows of the Church are the grief of her Lord, we lift our eyes unto the hills of the everlasting morning of the new city of God. And again light is poured out upon us, for we know that, whatever be the perplexities and the sadness of the present, and whatever suffering it may be we now have to bear,—in the eternal future, if only we are faithful to the truth and grace which we in England most certainly have received, we shall see light in the light of God. "For now we see through a glass in a riddle; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known."

NOTE

(See page 13.)

IT was assumed in the sermon that the teaching of Christ and His Church includes the doctrine of the indissolubility of Christian marriage. This is not the place for any lengthy discussion of this matter, but the following considerations may be pointed out. Our Lord recalled the concession of Moses¹ by which divorce was allowed in certain cases, and re-marriage, though spoken of slightly, was not expressly forbidden, and re-established the primitive law by which marriage was indissoluble.² In the records of His teaching preserved by St. Mark and St. Luke, He declared that the re-marriage after divorce of either husband or wife is adultery.³ In the Sermon on the Mount He described the divorce of a wife for any cause except "fornication" as having the special wrong of leading her to commit adultery, asserted that the "marriage" of any divorced woman is adultery, and said nothing on the possibility or otherwise of the re-marriage of a husband

¹ Deut. xxiv. 1-4. For the interpretation of this passage which regards it as only abstaining from prohibiting and not actually sanctioning re-marriage, see e.g., Driver, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, pp. 269-272; Luckock, *History of Marriage*, pp. 24-38 (second edition). On any interpretation, the re-marriage of the divorced woman is spoken of as her being "defiled"—the word which is used as descriptive of adultery in Lev. xviii. 20; Num. v. 13, 14, 20, etc.

² St. Matt. xix. 3-8; St. Mark x. 2-9.

³ St. Mark x. 11, 12; St. Luke xvi. 18.

who has put away his wife for "fornication."¹ A possible interpretation of the received text of St. Matt. xix. 9 makes that passage allow the re-marriage of a husband who has divorced his wife for "fornication." It seems unnatural to choose the interpretation of this passage which is difficult to reconcile with the other reports of our Lord's teaching, and apparently inharmonious with the general principle of indissolubility which He lays down. Moreover, the correctness of the text is very doubtful.² The teaching of St. Paul is very strongly in favour of the doctrine of indissolubility.³ Of Patristic belief and Conciliar decisions the immense preponderance is on the same side.⁴ The present writer has given such thought and work as have been in his power to the study of the subject, and the result on his mind has been a strong conviction that the Western law,⁵ which has been preserved since the separation in the sixteenth century by both Romans⁶ and Anglicans,⁷ rightly represents the law which the Apostles received from Christ and delivered to the Church, and which was in the earliest times universally recognized. Consequently, he felt justified in the sermon in speaking

¹ St. Matt. v. 31, 32. Observe that the proper translation of *ὅς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ* is, "whosoever shall marry a divorced woman."

² The variations in the MSS. are so remarkable as to point to the likelihood of there having been some corruption of early date. Observe that the Vatican MS. and other authorities omit any reference to re-marriage. The omission occurs in the marginal reading of the Revisers and of Westcott and Hort.

³ Rom. vii. 2, 3; 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11, 39; Eph. v. 31, 32.

⁴ This whole subject is treated with great completeness, accuracy, and impartiality in Watkins, *Holy Matrimony*.

⁵ There can be no question about the law of the Church in the West since the time of St. Augustine.

⁶ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xxiv., canon 7.

⁷ Canons 106, 107 of 1603 A.D.

of the present Eastern practice as a departure from the Christian law. The difference in custom between the East and the West on this point is, no doubt, one among many barriers to the reunion of Christendom. At the same time, it is alike a matter for thankfulness and a reason for hope that the East has never in theory altogether abandoned the doctrine of indissolubility. The Apostolical canon¹ which prohibits re-marriage is still recognized as the law of the Church; and while divorce which makes re-marriage possible is also recognized, it is stated that this is the outcome of the civil law.² The forms of service which plainly regard the marriage bond as indissoluble are still used. Thus, while divorce and re-marriage are frequent, and attended with distressing practical results, there is so far hope of better things that the letter of the original law has been retained.

¹ Canon 47, Εἴ τις λαϊκὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐκβάλλων ἑτέραν λάβῃ, ἢ παρ' ἄλλου ἀπολελυμένην, ἀφορίζεσθω. See Hardouin, *Concilia*, i. 21.

² Ἀπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν καὶ πολιτικῶν νόμων ἐπροχώρησεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Lists of grounds of divorce and re-marriage in which the practice of the Greek Church has admitted the enactments of the civil legislation, are given in Covell, *Some Account of the Present Greek Church*, pp. 218-227; Watkins, *Holy Matrimony*, pp. 352-362. Similar concessions have been made by the Russian Church. At the same time, it is fair to point out that the Russian writer Macarius limits the possibility of divorce and re-marriage to cases where adultery has been committed, and bases this position upon his interpretation of the teaching of our Lord in St. Matt. v. 32, xix. 9. See his *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, ii. 582, 583. It is of some interest to notice that the Eastern Bishops at the Council of Florence, on being pressed by the Westerns for a defence of their practice of dissolving marriages, merely answered that they did not act without good reason (τὰ συνοικέσια ἡμῶν οὐκ ἀλόγως χωρίζονται). See Hardouin, *Concilia*, ix. 429-432; Popoff, *History of the Council of Florence*, pp. 158, 159 (English translation).

The Relation of
Church and Parliament
in regard to
Ecclesiastical Discipline.

BY
WALTER HOWARD FRERE,
Of the Community of the Resurrection.



A. R. MOWBRAY & CO.,
OXFORD: 106, S. Aldate's Street;
LONDON: 64 and 65, Farringdon Street, E.C.
1903.

The Relation of Church & Parliament

in regard to

Ecclesiastical Discipline.

I.

THE delicate adjustment of the relations between Church and State is at all times a difficult task, and one that is very liable to the mishandling that comes from ignorance or prejudice or from confusion of thought. There come periods in history when these relations are barely, if at all, matters of discussion or of public interest; and again there come times of disputation, strain, and tension, when they excite great interest, and stir some of the strongest passions of man. Those times of tension and discussion are not by any means necessarily times also of change or readjustment; indeed, some of the chief changes and developments in the relations of Church and State have come about in the torpid periods when alterations excited no interest and met with no opposition, or when slackness and decadence have been allowed to effect an unobserved transformation. But if tension is not necessarily the herald of change, it calls upon thoughtful people to clear their minds, to brush up their facts, to scrutinize their terminology, and to verify their postulates.

A wave of dissatisfaction with the relations between Church and State has for some time now been passing over Europe, and a state of tension in more or less degree is the result. The prejudices called Clericalism

and Anti-clericalism have long been powerful factors in the public life of France; of late they seem to have crossed the Channel. It may very well be doubted by sober persons, who have some acquaintance with the facts of the case, whether the imposing proportions to which they pretend are not somewhat factitious.

Among the working classes in large towns anti-clerical feeling has been steadily on the decrease these fifty years. In country districts it has undoubtedly increased, and principally for the reason that the parson, being commonly associated with the squire, has had his share of the feeling of mistrust and suspicion with which the decaying ranks of country labourers regard their present magnates. Among the richer classes the power of tradition in religion is departing or departed; many still practise religion, while others, who have no conviction, no longer feel themselves bound by a traditional *comme il faut*. In such circles anti-clericalism has multiplied, for there has been a growing divergence. There was an old compact between the well-to-do laity and their brothers, cousins, and neighbours of the clergy, that the laity would do a little for God, provided they were not asked for too much. Now both parties have, to a large extent, receded from that compact. The laity are falling more and more, as in France, into two camps, and becoming either convincingly religious or frankly irreligious; and the latter will no longer for propriety's sake pay a minimum homage to God. Meanwhile the clergy are ceasing to be merely well-meaning persons with gentlemanly instincts and philanthropic leanings, and are becoming professional men, trained to their sacred calling as a doctor or sailor is trained. The result of this, where the training fails, is to produce clericalism, and in its wake anti-clericalism; and, even where it succeeds

and makes men efficient priests, it is likely to produce anti-clericalism, for there are many who regard all clerical efficiency as a thing to be resented. From all causes, therefore, it is no surprise to find these prejudices on the increase in the richer classes.

With the middle classes the case is different; neither sentiment nor tradition nor conviction has succeeded in retaining the bulk of them in the limits of the English Church. It was Nonconformity that moved them in the seventeenth century, and Wesley that won them in the eighteenth; and they still remain Nonconformist at heart, either (in the original sense of the word) as churchmen who still cling to the Church while trying to make out her doctrine and discipline to be other than they are; or else frankly as separatists who have inherited a venerable tradition of alienation.

The original causes of such separation were widely different: some left the Church sadly, as a mother who had proved too unnatural to care for them; others defiantly, as a stepmother, who, as they grew up, had ceased to have any longer the power to persecute; others, as the Scarlet Woman, only one shade lighter than Rome herself, and therefore to be shunned with much drawing aside of skirts and shaking off of dust.

So again the original tenets of those who separated were sharply at variance; for example, the Independent and the Presbyterian, when they had united to abolish the Church, had no further point of concord left, and began to demolish one another. Now all this is changed: the distinctive doctrines of the Churches have fallen into the background, and the Free Church Councils are united, not merely by their common animosity, but also by a positive refusal of all alliance with the State, a down grade agreement on a vanishing

residuum of Christian belief, and a well-intentioned but somewhat inconsistent eagerness to propagate at the expense of the State an undogmatic form of religion. All this is a tremendous change of front, but it does not involve any increase of anti-clerical feeling: at the base of all nonconformity there lie several revulsions of feeling—an exaggerated hatred of Rome, an unreasonable jealousy on behalf of the Bible (or of parts of it), and a repudiation of the historic teaching and discipline of the Catholic Church in the supposed interests of the individual conscience. No one can doubt therefore that the feeling of the large nonconformist majority of the middle classes is hot against the claims, and hotter still against the pretensions, of the Church as a teacher and guide, and of the clergy as her officers; but the temperature has fallen rather than risen, and the ritualist priestling in his biretta or his chasuble does not now stir depths of passion at all comparable to those which were roused by his remoter ancestor, the reading minister in his cassock and square cap, or even by his grandfather that preached in a surplice.

The result of this analysis is to shew two things: first, that though anti-clerical feeling is strong, its increase among the richer classes is more than balanced by the decrease elsewhere; secondly, that some part, at any rate, of its increase is due, not to unjustifiable pretensions, but to increased efficiency on the part of the Church at large, and of the clergy in particular.

This is not to say that the wave of dissatisfaction and the state of tension do not exist; undoubtedly they exist, but it is rather in the small world of journalism and of politics than in the larger world of religion. In this small area they have reached a

state which may be described as a crisis, or, more accurately, as a panic; and the reason of this is not far to seek. Nothing is so liable to induce panic as for a man to find himself called upon to handle strong forces which he does not understand. Religious controversy is for this reason, and very rightly, the pet aversion of the politician and the journalist; he steers clear of it as long as he can, and handles it only when panic seizes him and deprives him of his better judgment. This is what has been going on of late, and is still with us; it is a common feature of history. Should any one doubt this, let him look into the past, and survey the controversies of the last century as reflected, or caricatured, in the contemporary press, and recall the legislation that resulted therefrom; he will there find a convincing instance of the truth of the general statement, and will rise from the enquiry with a more trustworthy judgment of the present state of affairs.

The existing House of Commons has lived the greater part of its life on the verge of panic, and its declining years seem hardly likely to be more staid in this respect. True, it is growing increasingly conscious of its inability to handle these questions; but unfortunately this consciousness may as easily lead to the panic of interference, as to the wisdom which declines improper tasks. Thus the real matter of anxiety in the ecclesiastical outlook is, not either the internal or the external relations of the Church itself, but the behaviour of the House of Commons now goaded by journalists and Orange wire-pullers to intervene in circumstances where it has neither the right nor the capacity for intervention.

If in this time of tension there can be some reconsideration of the terms used and misused in the

discussion, some recalling of elementary principles of the relation of Church and State, some brushing up of historical evidence, and some exposure of popular misconceptions, much good may be done, a sounder public opinion may be formed, reasonable remedies may be found for evils which are acknowledged on all hands to need healing, and the House of Commons may be induced to recognise the fact that it is not its business to supervise the discipline of the Church.

II.

AMONG the terms in use in the discussion of the relations of Church and State that most need scrutiny at a period of tension such as the present is the term "compact;" it is a term that is constantly used to express these complicated relations, and, even when it is not explicitly employed, there is often latent in people's minds the idea that it expresses. A statement purporting to be authoritative, has lately asserted that—

"At the Reformation . . . the State agreed that the reformed Church should retain certain emoluments, and should have the privileges of the National Church so long as it adhered to the reformed faith and ceremonial as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles. The State on its side makes no claim whatever to alter the doctrines or the discipline of the Church, but promises to protect the Church in the possession of her endowments and privileges so long as she keeps to her part of the agreement. On the other hand the Church agreed to alter neither her doctrine nor her ritual, so long as she remained the National Church without consulta-

tion with the State. . . . Parliament has no right whatever to interfere with Church doctrine or ritual, but it has the right on behalf of the British people, to insist that the terms of compact made in the sixteenth century be religiously observed, and to enable the Church under the changed conditions of the twentieth century to enforce them upon her members."

This statement is liable to mislead seriously any one who comes to it without a considerable fund of historical knowledge. Not merely are details of it objectionable; see for example the suggestion that the affairs of the Church of England are according to the precedent of the sixteenth century the concern of "the British people"—a phrase which is meaningless if it is not meant expressly to include Scotland and Ireland; or see again, the way in which the writer covertly gives away the whole of the point, that he wishes to make, by speaking of "the changed conditions of the twentieth century": but the whole is unhistorical in its entire fabric and tone, and especially in that it can hardly fail to convey to the mind of an innocent reader, who does not know any better, the idea, that there was at the Reformation a new compact formally made, which exists somewhere in the Archives of Church or State, and has only to be produced in order to shew up the dishonest practices of some persons unknown who have of late receded from its time-honoured provisions. This idea is of course false, and ludicrously false to anyone who has any acquaintance with the ecclesiastical history of the sixteenth century; unfortunately most people have not sufficient knowledge of the facts to prevent them from being misled, and therefore it is necessary to scrutinize closely this suggestion of a compact made between Church and State at the Reformation.

That there is a compact between Church and State no one can wish to deny ; there always has been one of some sort ever since the coming of S. Augustine, and the official acceptance of the Christian religion by Anglo-Saxon kings ; this is a characteristic feature of English history, and the intimate bond between the two has been one of the most powerful factors in the development of England's greatness ; but, beginning thus at the dawn of the history, and being anterior to the coalescing of the separate kingdoms of the Heptarchy into the one English State, it is natural to find that the compact is all along based upon tradition. That tradition has been constantly subject to modification in one form or another, and through different agencies—the definite actions of Kings, Popes, Prelates, Synods, or Parliaments, as well as the more indefinite influences of time and change : but it subsists throughout the whole history as a mutual understanding based upon tradition.

Large modifications were no doubt made in the thirty years, from 1530 to 1560, and affecting great issues, but they touched after all but a relatively small part of the whole field of the mutual understanding between Church and State : they were, and they professed to be, a restoration of what had previously been, rather than an innovation ; the Norman kings had altered the traditions of the Saxons, and each succeeding century witnessed further modifications in one or other direction in the relations of Church and State. A good instance of this continual modification of a traditional arrangement is afforded by the history of the appointment to bishoprics. First, the Church fought with the Crown for the recognition of the spiritual part of the appointment, and finally came to terms which were a considerable alteration of existing

theory and practice. Then the right of canonical election was won, and very soon lost again, for the most part, because the Pope overrode the liberties of the electors. Then came the curbing of the papal power by the Statutes of Provisors; but the King, while nominally restoring their power to the electors by restraining papal interference, practically got the matter into his own hands by sending a "letter missive" directing the choice of the Chapter. And so the conflicts went on. They are a good instance of the way in which the traditional understanding of Church and State was being continually modified in the pre-Reformation days.

The Reformation changes, though theologically of quite a different calibre, are constitutionally only the successors of the foregoing. There was no new compact, but only a series of modifications of the traditional arrangement. This will be seen more clearly by considering two of the most central parts of that traditional arrangement. The first is the recognition by the State of the right of the Church, in some form or another, to meet and legislate for itself. This right, which had in earlier days been exercised in Councils, had more and more devolved upon the Convocations of the Clergy, which had originally come into existence for the purpose of clerical taxation; they had in this way been drawn into a closer analogy with Parliament, and thus, as a machinery for ecclesiastical legislation, had already become more amenable to direction from the Crown. Henry laid upon them far larger restrictions than had bound them before, by the Act for the Submission of the Clergy (25 Hen. viii. c. xix.), but it was a modification of what already existed, not a new compact; the old legislative power was to continue, but under greater restrictions.

The second instance to be taken is that of the judicial system of the Church. It was part of the immemorial constitution of the country that the Church should not merely legislate, but also exercise judicial functions for itself. Here, again, there was change, but only by way of some modification of the time-honoured state of things. The Act already mentioned forbade appeals to Rome, and with other similar legislation recovered the position of the Crown as the ultimate source of justice in causes ecclesiastical as well as civil; but, apart from this question of the Court of ultimate appeal, the whole system went on as before; there was no new compact; indeed the changes in the ecclesiastical administration of justice made in the sixteenth century by Henry were quite inconsiderable compared to those made in the early part of the nineteenth century—not to mention the more debateable changes of the middle years of the same period—which swept away with general approval the greater part of ecclesiastical suits, or transferred them to the civil courts.

Only one notable attempt was made at making a new compact to supersede the old arrangements, and it failed. This was the project of the "*Reformatio Legum*," a well meant endeavour to codify the Canon Law, so as to be able to start clear upon the new lines which were necessitated by the repudiation of the papal supremacy. There was certainly no sphere where it was so needful to have, if possible, a fresh start; for the papacy was so entirely interwoven into the whole fabric of the mediæval Canon Law that it seemed a hopeless task to try to eliminate it, and have any thing still left remaining. But the project came to nothing; and the reason is obvious and illuminating. The tradition was too strong; the breach with the past was

too great. If Bishops and their legal officials were still to go on administering the discipline of the Church, they must go on in the old way; and as for the difficulties and the anomalies that were bound to crop up, it must be a case of *solvitur ambulando* with them. And, even if the Puritans take it as a grievance, and decry the whole administration as inherently popish, it cannot be helped; but the civil judges must, if appealed to, support their ecclesiastical *confreves* and recognise the permanence of the old Canon Law.

There is, however, one sphere in which it seems at first sight as though a new compact may have been made. Hitherto, the State had had no reason to take any interest in all that side of Church discipline which is concerned with Services; but at the Reformation it discovered that it was worth its while to do so, not only in order to second the new enforcement of stricter uniformity, which the Church was seeking to carry out, but also in order to secure, for political reasons, the repression of dangerous dissidence. No doubt in a sense this may be called a new departure; but it would be more accurate to describe it as an extension of a principle already well recognised. The State had long been accustomed to lend its aid to enforce the discipline of the Church; this was indeed part of the traditional understanding; nothing was more suitable, according to the theory, than that the Church should appeal for the help of the State in any sphere where it found a difficulty in enforcing its discipline, and that the State should respond to the appeal. The State had thus brought its own proper terrors to bear, not only on contemners of the ecclesiastical courts in general, but also, upon special emergency, on heretics too. When once it was decided that it was important for the

Church that the diversities of rite and ceremony should yield to a new and fuller uniformity, nothing was more consonant with the old traditions than that the State should be asked to second its efforts in this department of discipline as in others; and if the State had its own reasons, too, for wishing to secure liturgical uniformity, that circumstance does not make what was done a new departure, except in the sense already limited, and certainly does not justify any one in thinking of Acts of Uniformity as forming a new compact. The more exact interpretation of the bearing of these Acts on the relations of Church and State must be left to a later stage.

Finally, it may be pointed out how entirely unlike the English position is to that of countries where there has been a definite compact formulated to be the terms of association of Church and State, or the treaty between the Pope and the secular government. There is no need to go far to seek out instances of these. In Scotland the old hierarchy was destroyed by Act of Parliament (1560), and with it went the rest of the organization and tenets of the pre-Reformation Church. A new ministry and a new organization was then set up. It was in its earlier form neither episcopal nor presbyterian, though at a later date it became first one and then the other. It was based on three documents: the Confession of Faith, the Book of Discipline, and the Book of Common Order; but the recognition of this new system on the part of the State came about only gradually. At first Parliament refused to sanction the Book of Discipline; then the Privy Council similarly refused, but allotted to the new ministry a fraction of the endowments that had once belonged to the Old Church, but had since been in lay hands. Finally, in 1567, the Parliament confirmed the Confession of Faith, made more permanent provision for the

stipends of the ministers, and declared the new organization to be the only true and holy Kirk of Jesus Christ within this realm.

For a Concordat it is natural to turn to France. After the Church had been destroyed at the Revolution, it was necessary that some steps should be taken for its restoration when happier days dawned. This was not done, as was the case at our English Restoration, by treating the recent events as null, and by merely going back to the *Status quo ante*, but a new documentary bargain was made (1801) between the Pope and the Government, called by the name which previous documents of the same sort had borne both in France and elsewhere, namely, a "Concordat."

Recent events have shewn how, even with a formal documentary bargain of this degree of definiteness, it is possible to have room for much dispute; and though it is characteristic of France to have all arrangements elaborately codified, she does not thereby escape an ecclesiastical crisis, compared to which the disturbance at home, however artfully fomented, is trifling indeed.

Our English character and our English history are alike different. We cling to the old, even when anomalous, sooner than devise an ideal new platform. It is therefore a misconception of both our national history and character to think of the Reformation as having involved a fresh compact between the Church and the State. It is true that their mutual relations were profoundly modified then; but they were undergoing continual modification before that time, and they have never ceased to undergo a continuous process of modification ever since.

It can therefore only cloud the issues to appeal to the sixteenth century as representing either a definite or a permanent compact between Church and State.

III.

ANOTHER term in constant employment in this discussion, which also needs close scrutiny, is the term State. It is far too readily assumed at the present time that that term in this connexion is only a synonym for Parliament; and there are few mistakes more fatal to the comprehension of the whole question.

According to the theory current in England in the middle of the sixteenth century, the State consists of the Crown, as the head of the body politic, with the spirituality and the temporalty as the body; which body is divided into three estates—the Lords Spiritual, the Lords Temporal, and the Commons. Its executive is thus to be looked on as two-fold, comprising the Royal and the Parliamentary authority. Therefore, in any discussion of the relations of Church and State, the first thing necessary to enquire is this, whether by the term State is meant Crown, or Parliament, or both; and these distinctions are of primary importance. Throughout the whole of the changes in the relations of Church and State in the sixteenth century, the distinction between the relation of the Church to the Crown, and its relation to the Parliament was jealously preserved; and it is necessary to go somewhat fully into this history, in order to recover principles, which have been left too long out of sight, and to obviate a repetition in the future of blunders which have resulted in consequence.

The great Reformation changes of Henry VIII. involve these two principles: (1) that the ecclesiastical Supremacy recovered from the Pope is a Royal Supremacy, and not a Parliamentary Supremacy; (2) that all matters directly affecting the Spirituality are rightly only to be initiated (by agreement with the Crown) in the assemblies of the Clergy.

The first of these needs only to be stated to be recognised, though it must have some further exposition before its full force is realized; the second is far more a matter of controversy, and the history that it involves is far more intricate, therefore its handling requires some fullness and much care. It will be best, therefore, to review briefly some of the chief of the changes in the relation of Church and State made in the sixteenth century, with special reference to the circumstances that bear on one or other of these points.

At the first sessions of the great Reformation Parliament of 1529, a strong anti-clerical spirit was manifested, and two Acts touching the clergy, and of an objectionable character to them, were passed. This behaviour evoked a strong remonstrance from Convocation at the breach of constitutional precedent, but one that was apparently unsuccessful. Meanwhile the Convocation went on with plans of its own for reform of abuses.

It is significant that the series of occurrences to be observed for our purpose should start with an infringement and a protest; the principle was recognised even when it was not observed: and it was the interest of the Crown as well as of the new men of the royal circle to do anything that would humble the clergy, and to reduce them to emulate the Commons in subserviency.

The sessions of 1531 did not touch the relation of Church and Parliament, but they extorted from the clergy the acknowledgment of the Royal Supremacy in terms which, though they were too gross to survive long, were considerably less objectionable than those at first propounded to the Convocation by the King. The humiliation was great, and indeed the extortion of the acknowledgment was more intended to humiliate

than to claim any novel status; but, be it observed, that the Supremacy recognised was that of the Crown, not that of the Parliament. Even in its lowest days the clergy never demeaned itself so far as to accept a Parliamentary Supremacy, though Parliament at the time was very largely composed of spiritual persons, more than half of the Upper House being prelates, and contained no one who was not a churchman and a communicant.

The year following saw the famous Submission of the Clergy, by which they bound themselves not to make new canons without the Royal assent; and it is important to notice that this serious curtailment of the former liberties of the Church was made by vote of Convocation itself, and not of Parliament. Further, it was the Convocation that took the initiative in the chief piece of ecclesiastical legislation of this date, the abolition of annates; in the lesser measures that dealt with the procedure of ecclesiastical courts, &c., there is no sign that it took action.

In 1533 began the series of enactments to abolish the jurisdiction of the Pope in England, and to secure that appeals were to be decided by the metropolitans, or, in matter that touched the King, by the Upper House of Convocation of the province. These bodies themselves meanwhile were entirely taken up with the affair of the King's divorce, and seem to have had no hand in the matter. Next year, however, they accompanied the anti-papal legislation of Parliament with declarations that the Pope ought to have no power in England; and Parliament incorporated with that legislation a confirmation of the restrictions on the legislative power of the Church, which the clergy had already accepted in their Submission.

It is unnecessary to give further details of this

reign. The rights of the clergy in their convocations to a share in legislation that affected them is recognised as a principle of the constitution, even though in these troublous times it is honoured from time to time rather in the breach than in the observance.

In the reign of Edward VI. constitutional procedure was utterly neglected, not only in this, but in many other respects. The chantries were destroyed, as the monasteries had been before them, without the clergy being asked to share the onus or the sin of the measure; and the right of election to bishoprics went without a word. The earlier liturgical reforms of the reign, like those of Henry's day, were made without any reference to Parliament; they were the result of an agreement made, not very formally, by the Church and the Crown. But when the Divines had prepared the new English Service-book, it was advisable to secure uniformity by such penalties as only an Act of Parliament could enact; and the two Acts of Uniformity were the result. Here the Church took all the initiative, and the Parliament seconded its efforts. It is clear that the second book was not submitted to Convocation, and doubtful whether the first was; but in any case the Church, in some form or another, took the lead in defining its own discipline, and only called in the aid of Parliament to reinforce what it had already decided, though clearly the first Act, to a certain extent, carried with it a restriction on the Church's part of her own liturgical freedom, since it necessitated a further Act of some sort whenever any important change was to be made.

But the Convocation did not let the constitution lapse into chaos without a bold attempt to mend matters, as far as its own privileges were concerned.

In 1547 it protested, first against the delay in the reform of canon law, which had been the project to which it had assented in the Submission of the Clergy; and secondly, against the handling of ecclesiastical matters in Parliament without consultation with itself. The protests were sadly ineffective, but at any rate they served to keep alive the memory of the true principles of action, until days when they would receive better recognition. Meanwhile the clergy were in advance of the secular legislators in passing Communion under both kinds, and in sanctioning the marriage of their Order.

In the first Parliament of Elizabeth, both the two points under consideration were raised afresh after the reaction of Mary's reign. The Act of Supremacy once again annexed to the Crown the former and legitimate visitatorial power and jurisdiction, declaring the Queen to be Supreme Governor of the Realm, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal. Again, it is a Royal Supremacy, and Parliament claims nothing of the sort for itself over the Church. Provision is made on new lines for the exercise of this authority; formerly Henry had used his reasserted power, as from time to time it pleased him, even to the extent of making Thomas Cromwell his Vicar-General, and using him, not only in a visitatorial capacity, but even to preside in Convocation. Now a proviso was inserted for the exercise of these functions by a person or persons to be appointed to act for the Crown by letters patent, and from that clause there arose the Ecclesiastical Commission, which came, not only to exercise the royal jurisdiction in ecclesiastical affairs, but also to a dangerous extent to supersede the more normal and regular jurisdiction of the Episcopate. It was an attempt on the part of the Crown to back up

or even stimulate the authority of the Bishops—a legitimate outcome of the Royal Supremacy, though it was misused, and thus became detested ultimately, and regarded as the synonym for all that was iniquitous.

The same Act, in touching on the question of Heresy, rehearsed the old constitutional principle for whose better recognition the Convocation had petitioned in 1547, with so little success. Among heresies, it says, such things may be reckoned as have been determined so to be “by the High Court of Parliament of this realm with the assent of the Clergy in their Convocation.” The rehearsal of this is all the more valuable at this moment because, from the peculiar circumstances of the situation, it was not being acted upon in the ecclesiastical legislation that was going on. The sitting Convocation was entirely Marian in its views; this was not unnatural, considering that it was more an official than an elective body, and that the leaders of the clergy of the contrary persuasion, if not dead, were either in exile or in hiding. It was clearly useless to submit the Government’s plans to such a body as this: and indeed the Government had quite enough to do to find means of carrying some of its desires through the Houses of Parliament, and in face of the unswerving opposition of the prelates there.

Thenceforward the relations of Church and Parliament are, for a long spell, of great interest. The second Parliament was opened by a speech from the Lord Keeper, Sir N. Bacon (Jan. 12, 1563), which spoke of disorders in the Church that needed amendment—want of diligence in preachers, want of attention and credit in hearers, ministers few, and some of them insufficient, laxness of discipline, that has bred loose living on the one hand, and neglect of the ornaments prescribed for worship on the other. The Bishops must see to all this;

if the Act of Uniformity is not stringent enough to force men to church, it must be made more so; if it is, let them see it executed. It would be well to have two disciplinary officers appointed for each diocese; but the chief care of all this pertains to the Lords of the Spirituality, and they must take steps about reforms. Parliament will then join laws to their measures, not only for the more perfecting of the same, but for the maintenance as well of the heads as the ministers thereof.

It was a good exposition of the old principles, and the Bishops acted upon it. A Bill was originated by Convocation, and passed, in an enlarged form, by Parliament for securing greater efficiency in the sentence of excommunication. Two other propositions from the Convocation House were less fortunate, and were rejected.

In the next Parliament the first signs began to shew themselves of a wish on the part of some of the Commons to take the initiative in Church reform. On December 5th, 1566, a Bill was introduced into the Commons to establish the Articles of Religion, which had been newly revised by Convocation, and published with semi-official royal approval in 1563. It passed, and was sent up to the Lords on the 14th. After a single reading it was stopped there by order of the Queen, who was very angry at its introduction into the Parliament, blamed the Bishops for it, and was little mollified when they disclaimed having had a hand in the matter, but begged her to allow it to go forward.

The first attempt of an Elizabethan Parliament to take the initiative in ecclesiastical affairs was thus a complete failure; the reasons for that failure, and the motives of the Queen's action, will come out more clearly when the question comes up again in a fuller form in the next Parliament.

This measure had been the hardest of a litter of six: the other bills had been killed at the birth; but on April 7th, 1571, the whole six were revived and presented afresh to the Commons with a new addition, and had the honour of committees and a first reading apiece. The House proceeded, however, very cautiously, feeling its ground, and gradually pushing on one after another of its bantlings, not without conference with the Lords.

Meanwhile a parallel development was taking place. Mr. Strickland made a long discourse calling attention to the superstitious blots in the Prayer Book, and to the abuses of ecclesiastical government, and complaining that authority and great livings were in the hands of known Papists—meaning no doubt, by that term, Churchmen more loyal than himself, as is the way of his sort. He concluded by asking the House to appoint committees to confer with the Lords of the Spirituality for consideration and reformation of these matters. This was on April 6th, and a week later, on Easter Even, it was evident that this move was also progressing. Committees had been appointed in each House, and had arranged to spend Palm Sunday afternoon in conference; Secretary Smith had said cautious words in favour of consulting the Bishops on other ecclesiastical business also; Recorder Fleetwood had replied with a legal argument that such a course was unnecessary; the Queen herself had sounded a warning note in a Message that she had sent, telling the Commons to spend little time in motions, and to avoid long speeches. It was under such circumstances of encouragement alike and discouragement that Strickland introduced his Bill for the Reformation of the Prayer Book. It was well received by the House; but the Treasurer, Knollys, thought it ought to be referred to the Queen, for fear

that it might be an interference with her Prerogative ; and Hatton, the Comptroller, urged definitely that the time and the place were not fit, and that such heady and hasty proceedings, contrary to and before the law, did rather hinder than help. In the end the House decided to petition the Queen for leave to proceed with the Bill. When it met again, after the recess, Mr. Strickland was not there, having been sent for by the Council in the meanwhile, and detained by its command from attending the House for infringing the Prerogative of the Queen in introducing his Bill. The Commons were at first disposed loudly to resent this development, as an invasion of their privileges, but Treasurer and Comptroller again recalled them to a truer estimate of their place. The Speaker, at the instance of the members of the Council, stopped the debate, and later on in the day Strickland was restored to his duties.

A fortnight later another rap on the knuckles was inflicted by the Crown, this time on both Houses. Their committees had gone on consulting about the group of ecclesiastical Bills, and the Bill for the Articles had reached the same stage at which its career had been checked in the previous Parliament, when the committees brought back the news that the Queen had sent a Message to express her approval of the Articles, and her intention to publish them and have them executed by the Bishops, by direction of her Highness' regal authority of Supremacy of the Church of England, and not to have the same dealt in by Parliament. In the end two only of the group of seven Bills passed into law ; one was a small measure dealing with the leases of benefices, the other was the important Act, "For the ministers of the Church to be of sound religion," which was principally concerned

with exacting from certain classes of clergy that subscription to the Articles which had been already demanded in general by the simple ecclesiastical authority. Since the action of the Church had preceded the action of the State, there was no objection to be raised to this.

In the Parliament of the next year (1572) the activity of the Puritans was taken up, not with trying to subject the Church to a parliamentary discipline, for the Commons had learnt their lesson for the moment, and were not disposed again to court reproof and failure, but with trying to goad them on to the task which they were wise enough, for this occasion, to decline. The "Admonitions" represent, among other things, the protest of a section of the people against the constitutional view of the relations of Church, Crown, and Parliament, which the Crown, even more than the Church, had shewn itself determined to uphold. The Queen had had, moreover, an opportunity of restating her determination, and she had not missed it. The Parliament was only a fortnight old, and had thrice read one of two Bills concerning rites and ceremonies, when the Speaker was called upon to deliver a further Message from the Queen "that her Highness' pleasure is, that from henceforth no Bills concerning religion shall be preferred or received into this House, unless the same should be first considered and liked by the clergy." The offending Bills were delivered over to her Majesty, and she expressed openly her disapproval, especially of the first of them. After this it was not surprising that the House was on its best behaviour for the rest of the session; and not surprising also, perhaps, that the disappointment of the baffled reformers was so bitterly expressed in the "Admonitions."

From this Parliament one member went home very sore. Peter Wentworth had been one of the committees of the House who had been urgent in the matter of the Articles of Religion in the previous Parliament of 1571; he had then come into conflict with Archbishop Parker, who pointed out to the committees that it was not the province of the House to pick and choose, but to accept them *en bloc*, and "refer themselves wholly to the Bishops therein." Wentworth indignantly replied, that to do this was to make the Bishops into popes, and he would have none of it; but his protest was in vain. The new Parliament, in its earlier session, had brought him no comfort, but, on the contrary, he had seen the Crown again assert itself. In the interval of four years that had elapsed since the previous session, he had occupied himself in writing out a speech of protest against the Queen's treatment of the Parliament in matters both civil and ecclesiastical. On the first morning of the new session (Feb. 8, 1576) he delivered himself of this philippic: he was not allowed to finish it, and in the afternoon he found himself a prisoner, under examination by a committee of the House concerning his "violent and wicked words." He had complained in the first place in general of the subservience of the House to the rumours as to the wishes of the Queen, and in the second place of the Messages from the Crown "either of commanding or inhibiting, very injurious to the freedom of speech and consultation." As to the Message that Parliament "should not deal in any matters of religion, but first to receive from the Bishops," he said that it was a doleful Message, prohibiting them from dealing in God's causes, or seeking to advance His glory, and such as was bound to forfeit the blessing of God upon the work of the

session; he quoted the precedent of 1559, when the Parliament had taken the initiative, and laid at the door of the Bishops the blame of this inhibition. Besides the ecclesiastical question he had much also to complain of in the Queen's dealings with Parliament in the matter of the Queen of Scots. On the day following the committees reported adversely to the House, and he was sent as close prisoner to the Tower, where he remained over a month before he was, by the favour of the Queen, restored to his liberty and his place in the House. (March 12, 1576.)

Later on, when the House proposed to deal with the thorny subject of Discipline in the Church, it proceeded cautiously. A petition was drawn up to the Queen, and the Council was moved to take the matter up. Then a Bill was prepared and read once. A week ensued, and the Council presented the petition to the Queen, and received answer as follows:—"Her Majesty before the Parliament had a care to provide in that case of her own disposition; and at the beginning of this session her Highness had conference therein with some of the Bishops, and gave them in charge to see due reformation thereof; wherein, as Her Majesty thinketh, they will have good consideration according to her pleasure and express commandment in that behalf; and further, if the said Bishops should neglect or omit their duties therein, then Her Majesty, by her supreme power and authority over the Church of England, will speedily see such good redress therein as may satisfy the expectations of her loving subjects to their good contentation."

The same Parliament sat again early in 1581, and reverted to its petitions. In this instance, however, it did more wisely in addressing itself to the Bishops, and found some of them very willing to take up the

grievances, and join in the petition to the Queen. The Lower House of Convocation was also moving on the same subject. A considerable programme of reform was drawn up, and it seemed as if there were all the conditions ready for a successful redressing of crying evils; but the Queen was again obdurate, apparently for no other reason, except that the movement had been initiated in the Parliament; and, when pressed by the Bishops, all that she would allow was a smaller programme of reform, to be carried out solely by the episcopal authority, without Parliament having any share in it. The prevention of the larger scheme was no doubt a misfortune to the Church, but it was insisted on by the Queen in defence of the true principles of the relation of Church and Parliament, which, as was proved, by many other instances than this, were more clearly perceived and more tenaciously held by the Queen than by the Episcopate.

When the next Parliament assembled in November, 1584, the strenuous *régime* of Whitgift had taken the place of the inefficiency of Grindal. He had already done much in the way of reforming abuses, though not always in the way that was agreeable to the Puritan party, and, when the Parliament began again with its petitions for reform, it found that in many respects it had been forestalled by the action of the Archbishop, and that in others it had in him a powerful and convinced antagonist, who would not yield at all to Puritan innovations that tampered with the constitution of the Church. The days had passed when the Crown had stood alone in her defence, and a new stage of the history had opened in which the attempts at interference on the part of Parliament with the Church's liberties would soon be brought to an end. Whitgift was quite equal to making short

work of the petitions without having to invoke the aid of the Queen. Thereupon the Convocations went on their own way, and passed a very valuable set of canons, which became a real instrument of reform. When their representatives were received in audience by the Queen on February 27th, she was especially gracious to them, thanked them profusely for their subsidy, contrasting their generosity favourably with the reluctance of the Parliament. She would not suffer the reproachful speeches of the nether House against the Church, nor allow them to "meddle with matters above their capacity not pertaining to them." She did not deny that there were things that needed amendment, indeed she called attention to some of them in very clear terms, but she promised to call to account any that molested the Church in dealing with her own business, even though they are supported by some of the Council.

Parliament greatly resenting its rebuff, applied itself to ecclesiastical legislation on its own account; several ecclesiastical measures passed the Lower House, and two attained to the Upper; then the Archbishop appealed to the Crown, complaining of this action, both as being a defiance of the Queen's Messages, and as being in detail injurious to the Church. When the session was brought to an end, five days later, none of the Bills in question had passed, and the Queen smoothed over the soreness of the House by a diplomatic speech. Speaking of the fault-finders with the Order of the Clergy, she said that they might become a slander to herself and the Church, for, since God had made her its over-ruler, her negligence could not be excused, if any schisms or errors heretical were suffered. "Thus much I must say," she continued, "that some faults and negligences may

grow and be, as in all other great charges it happeneth. And what vocation without? All which if you, my Lords of the Clergy, do not amend, I mean to depose you. Look ye, therefore, well to your charges. This may be amended without heedless or open exclamations." Thus the laity were gratified by the blaming of the Bishops, while the Bishops had their way as to the main issue.

But Parliament had not yet entirely learnt its lesson. At the end of February, 1587, when the excitement over the Queen of Scots had been closed by her execution, there re-appeared in the Commons a "Bill and Book," which had already figured there twice in abortive attempts on the part of Puritan members to establish the Presbyterian Discipline in the Church, and to substitute the Genevan Service-book for the Book of Common Prayer. The introducer on this occasion was a Mr. Cope, and he asked that his documents should be read to the House. The Speaker thereupon reminded the House of the previous commands that had come from the Queen not to meddle with this matter, and desired that Mr. Cope's request should be refused on that account. A discussion ensued between those who were in favour of the reading and those that opposed it, and this occupied the whole of the rest of the sitting, so that when the House rose, nothing had been decided. At its close the Queen sent for the documents, together with similar ones that had been exhibited on previous occasions, and the next day had an interview with the Speaker, which prevented the meeting of the House. On the third day (March 1st) Mr. Wentworth's wrath was again at boiling point, and he came to the House armed with a speech and eight pointed questions as to the rights of free speech, the privileges

of the Parliament, and the powers of the Speaker; his demand, that they should be read as an introduction to his speech, was met by a reminder on the part of the the Speaker, that it was better to wait until the Queen's pleasure was known with regard to the Bill and Book; and when he persisted in his demand, the Speaker took his papers to peruse first; having done so he "pocketted them up and shewed them to Sir T. Heneage, who so handled the matter that Mr. Wentworth went to the Tower, and the questions not at all moved." The Queen again sent for the Speaker, and so closed the sitting, and on the following day Mr. Cope and three of his supporters went to share Wentworth's fate. When a petition was mooted in Parliament for the restoration of the imprisoned members, the Vice-Chamberlain spoke at length, justifying the Queen's action, and explaining the obnoxious character of the proposals made. Shortly afterwards a motion was made for an appeal to her Majesty to redress disorders in the ministry, and further steps were taken to secure the release of the prisoners; while a more bold step still was taken in petitioning the Queen on behalf of the Presbyterian "Platform," and the whole scheme of the Puritan revolution. Her reply to this was as uncompromising as ever; she is satisfied with the present reformation, and considers the objections raised against it to be frivolous; the substitute proposed is prejudicial from many points of view; even if there are abuses, continual legislation about them is undesirable, and "it appertaineth to the clergy more properly to see the same redressed." Moreover, the petition is an infringement of the prerogative of the Crown, and the supremacy in Church causes now annexed to the imperial Crown of this realm.

When an attempt was made in the following

Parliament, by Mr. Dampart, to criticise the action of the Bishops and their administration of ecclesiastical government (Feb. 25, 1589), he was at once reminded that the session had been begun with an inhibition from the Queen, warning the Parliament not to deal with ecclesiastical causes, and the matter was at once dropped.

A similar warning was given to the new Speaker, Sir E. Coke, at the beginning of the Parliament of 1593. "Mr. Speaker, her Majesty's pleasure is that if you perceive any idle heads . . . which will meddle with reforming the Church and transforming the Commonwealth, and do exhibit any Bills to such purpose, that you receive them not until they be viewed and considered by those, who it is fitter should consider of such things and can better judge of them." The warning was not superfluous: a week had not passed before Mr. Morrice complained in the Commons of the stringency of the episcopal discipline, and produced two Bills intended to restrain it. In the debate which followed, some discussed the questions on their merits, others confined themselves to pointing out the danger of taking them up in defiance of the Queen's Messages. In the end the Speaker took the Bills unread to peruse, and in the same afternoon he was sent for to Court, and charged with a new Message which he delivered on the day following, to the effect that Parliament had been summoned for other purposes, and had been specially warned at the opening not to intrude into ecclesiastical causes, and therefore that no such Bills were to be exhibited or read.

It is merely the same story once again: the only fresh interest in this case is, that the mouthpiece on this occasion was the great constitutional lawyer, Sir E. Coke.

When Mr. Finch offered a Bill to the next Parliament (Dec. 3, 1597), to reform disorders touching Ministers of the Church, no attention was paid to his offer. So with this rapid *diminuendo* ended the attempt of a Puritan section of Parliament to secure for itself a power of control over the Church, at least so far as the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion is concerned.

It is no part of the present task to pursue the history in detail from Parliament to Parliament through the seventeenth century. It has been enough to shew what are the principles that underlie the relation of Church and Parliament, as defined in the era of the Reformation; and to remind the present generation that in the constitutional system of England the Parliament has no initiative in ecclesiastical affairs, and that it legislates in such matters only when the initiative has been taken by the clergy.

It is, however, worth while to call attention to two broad facts of the seventeenth century which reinforce this point, otherwise it might be supposed that the relation between Church, Crown, and Parliament, which has been revealed by the Elizabethan history, was one of the features of the constitution, which were transformed by the changes of the succeeding century. At the Rebellion, when the Parliament usurped a new position, and destroyed for the time the orderly constitution of the realm, its treatment of the Church was all of a piece with the rest, and the successors of the Puritan faction of Elizabeth's day did not rest until they had not merely got control of the Church, but had first transformed it, and then abolished it as a part of the English constitution. The movements that had been abortive in the previous century now produced their results; and it is possible for all to

see what the results involved in such a revolution were, and the wisdom of the Elizabethan policy which staved off such results.

These results, however, were not lasting, and the Restoration marks the return to the old principles, in this respect as in so many others. The new Act of Uniformity exemplified the recovery of the old principles of the alliance of Church and State: indeed the most scrupulous care was taken to secure the liberties of the Church in this very crucial moment. The initiative was taken by Convocation; when it had produced its book the King sent it to Parliament; Parliament received it as the form already agreed upon by the Church and Crown. The Commons asserted their right of discussing the changes made by Convocation in the book, for it had come within their competence through having been already authorized by the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity; but they decided not to exercise it, and accepted the changes *en bloc*; even the correction of clerical errors was not made without reference to the Convocation, so scrupulous was the care taken not to infringe the ancient terms of alliance.

IV.

THE question now rises as to the meaning of Acts of Uniformity; for clearly these have a special bearing upon the relation of Church and Parliament. On the one side clericalism may be inclined to argue that they are a mere civil enactment which does not bind the Church, while anti-clericalism or erastianism might attempt to reply that they are the directions given by the State to the Church as to the method that it is to employ in its public worship; between these two

extreme statements there is a large field for other intermediate views.

In examining the question it is important first to notice that uniformity in worship is a thing with which, ordinarily speaking, a State does not concern itself; if it does so, it is because some exceptional circumstances force it to take an exceptional course. Throughout the greater part of the history of the Church of England, the State has had no interest in the matter; even in 1542, when the civil control of the Established Church was more oppressive than it had ever been since Saxon times, or has ever been since, the Church made great moves in the direction of liturgical uniformity without the Parliament interesting itself in the matter at all. But when the reign of Edward came, and greater liturgical changes were prepared by the Church, the State saw that it was to its own interest that the new Services should be universally accepted; and, therefore, Parliament enforced the substitution of the English Book for the Latin Books by severe civil penalties. It was a State necessity that no other Services should be allowed, and the State felt it to be now as essential for it to secure this beforehand by adding the sanction of a penal Act to the liturgical innovations prepared by the clergy, as it was to secure quiet afterwards by repressing the Cornish rebels, who rose in favour of the restoration of the superseded Latin rites. The frontier between the provinces of Church and State was, in these instances, not respected in as careful a fashion as was right, for Edward's days were days of increasing anarchy. But in spite of irregularities, it is clear, even with regard to the Edwardine Acts, that their purport was to accept at the hands of the Church and Crown a certain set of Services, and to secure that these should be adopted, not only in

deference to the ecclesiastical authority which promulgated the Book, but also from fear of the civil penalties which Parliament thought well to enact against offenders.

The case of the Elizabethan Act is in some ways clearer still, though in other respects it is more irregular. Liturgical uniformity was more than ever a political necessity, and, therefore, Parliament was bound to hasten at once to secure it. The existing Convocation was entirely hostile, but the State could not afford to take that into account, or even to wait till the Convocation was altered in temper by the revulsion of feeling against the Marian religion which was spreading through the country. Parliament was forced by stress of circumstances to act unconstitutionally, and to decide for itself on a standard of liturgical uniformity. The varied temper of the House made this a very difficult task. Some thought the recent Prayer Book too much of an innovation, and some too little, and this difference of opinion in the House was but a reflection of the divergence of feeling outside. Eventually it seemed best, all things considered, to fix upon the last Prayer Book, modified by as few changes as possible, to be the standard, and to enact the measure which gave it authority with as little delay as might be, in order to forestall conflicts and even rebellions which were bound to ensue, unless some such strong enforcement of uniformity were effected.

This Act, therefore, represents a purely civil enactment; it was a violation of the tradition of the alliance of Church and State—as indeed its authors were the first to acknowledge—but it was to be justified by the exceptional circumstances of the time.

The Church had no initiative in the matter, but she accepted the parliamentary Act, and accepted it all the

more readily because the Act did not hamper her own action. The Book, which she actually used, never did correspond exactly with the Book authorized by the Act, and as time went on, the Church allowed the divergence to become greater. The royal order for wafer bread modified one rubric, and the episcopal directions concerning ornaments modified another. Further changes of a like sort followed, so that it soon came to pass that the Uniformity Act was in fact enforcing, not the system of worship laid down by its provisions, but that system as altered by subsequent non-Parliamentary changes. The non-conforming Puritans saw this clearly, and complained of it bitterly. "This Book on whose account we suffer," they said in effect, "is not the Book ordered by the Act. Why should we be punished for not wearing the surplice, while others who equally do not wear other ornaments prescribed by the Act are left unmolested?" Such arguments fell on deaf ears, and for this very good reason, that the authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, knew very well that the purpose of the legislation was not to prescribe a Parliamentary system of worship, or even to hold the Church to any particular bargain in respect of its Services, but simply to lend civil support to the power of the ecclesiastical rulers for the enforcement of that system which the Crown and Church agreed to be desirable.

Thus the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, although it began with great irregularities, ended by bringing out into relief the real principle that underlies such Acts. They are not bonds to bind the Church, or fetter its governors so that they cannot freely exercise their authority; nor even are they necessarily a stringent compact entered into by Church and State for the settlement of all ritual questions: they represent

the civil and penal sanction which Parliament, for its own reasons under particular circumstances, has thought wise to give to the Church's system, while leaving her considerable latitude to modify or add to that system in detail without hindrance.

The Uniformity Act of 1662 has already been treated, and it has been pointed out with what scrupulous delicacy the frontier of Church and State was respected. The principle of the legislation was, as before, that it added civil and penal sanction to the Church's system of worship without curtailing her liturgical liberties: it bound not Church authority, but only impugnors of Church authority.

When the various measures became law which introduced Toleration and Emancipation, they, in a very large degree, amounted to a repeal of the Acts of Uniformity and other Acts like them which had insisted upon conformity: thenceforward Recusants and Sectaries—two of the classes penalized by these Acts—were allowed to go their own way. In so far, however, as these measures were directed against non-conforming clergy of the Church, their provisions were not abrogated; and in so far as they survive now upon the Statute Book, they still perpetuate civil penalties against those who, in open prayer, refuse to use the Prayer Book or substitute for it some other and unauthorized form.

V.

In the nineteenth century it was considered necessary to pass an Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, in order to authorize Shortened forms of Morning and Evening Prayer, and Additional Services (1872). This step shews how the nature of the compact

between Church and State embodied in an Act of Uniformity had at the time been forgotten. Both Shortened forms of Prayer and Additional Services had been in use from the day when the last Act of Uniformity had been passed; and no one then supposed that such use was any infringement of the Act, or was anything else indeed but the legitimate exercise by Church authority of a liturgical right which it still retained, the Act of Uniformity notwithstanding. But the old cordiality had died down in the winter of the early years of the century, and the latter years of the previous century. The traditions had been lost, and a new and rigid legalism had taken their place, which took every opportunity of surrendering the Church's liberties, and transforming her ancient alliance into a novel bondage.

The beginnings of this disastrous change had manifested themselves long before 1872; indeed the tendency was characteristic of the century, and is traceable only too plainly in a series of misguided ecclesiastical enactments. The series began with the Act of 1832, which, by a mere piece of bungling, destroyed the Final Court of ecclesiastical appeal, and attempted, without the consent of the Church, to make the Court of the Privy Council into an ecclesiastical court. The authors of this change little foresaw the confusion that would result from their inadvertence; but it is not too much to say that this ill-advised action on the part of Parliament has not only flagrantly broken the best traditions of the alliance of Church and State, but has also thrown the whole judicial system of the Church into confusion, and is responsible in the highest degree for the present paralysis of coercive discipline. The knowledge that every appeal will go to this Court invalidates in the eyes of a large and ever increasing

body of churchmen the action of every ecclesiastical court. The fact that other courts are held to be bound by its decisions has robbed the true courts, diocesan and provincial, of any power to set matters straight; while the actual decisions given by the Privy Council have not been of a kind either to restore or to create confidence by any intrinsic merits of their own, but, on the contrary, they are discredited in the eyes of the public, and are in practice disregarded by almost the whole of the clergy, from the Bishops downward; and even by those who would not, on principle, dispute the competence of the Court.

Next, in 1840, Parliament was so far forgetful of its place and of the ancient terms of alliance with the Church as to pass a Discipline Act for the Church on its own initiative, thus infringing what we have seen to be the time-honoured provisions of the Constitution. That this was possible is only a further sign of that aggressive tendency which has already been alluded to as characteristic of the time. Though this was no proper Church measure, a number of Bishops used the powers, which even this Act was careful to retain in their hands, and from 1845 to 1874 a number of prosecutions were the result. The proceedings began in the proper Episcopal Courts, but the appeals went to the Privy Council. In some cases the clergy refused to appear or to recognise that Court. Moreover, the judgements were so contradictory, and appeared to many to be so prejudiced, that more harm was done than good. The chaos introduced by the unfortunate action of Parliament was only made worse by the efforts of civilians unversed in Ecclesiastical Law and liturgical and historical science.

In order to cover this failure, Parliament, at the instance of Archbishop Tait, passed in 1874 a new

Act, intended to deal more summarily with offenders. This, the Public Worship Regulation Act, increased the facilities for prosecution, diminished the part of the Bishop in any proceedings, but reserved to him a veto, appointed a new judge to a very anomalous position for the moment, but with the prospect of his becoming the judge of both Provincial Courts. A fresh outbreak of prosecutions ensued; Lord Penzance, the first judge appointed under the Act, refused to qualify as an ecclesiastical judge according to the Canons, and for this, as well as other reasons, a large proportion of churchmen refused to recognise him or his court. The prosecutions went on, and became more and more of a scandal and a farce, till after twelve years of ill success they ceased. The prosecuting party was too ill supported to be able to go on prosecuting, the public was scandalized, partly by the impotence of the novel system, and partly by its success in some instances in imprisoning loyal and devoted clergy. The whole of this Parliamentary action had outraged the consciences of many, and raised the scorn of more; the men that were supposed to be lawbreakers had been proved, in some respects, to be more law-abiding than their persecutors; and, as prejudice died down, and the questions at issue began to have a more learned and impartial hearing, the tide turned, and the persecuting party began to realize that, if it went on, the laugh would very soon be on the other side.

The nett result of these Acts of Parliament has been to reduce the system of Ecclesiastical Courts to chaos, and to paralyze Church discipline. No other result could well have been expected, seeing that the whole was done in defiance of the true principles of the relation of Church and State.

Since the cessation of the ritual suits against Priests

two or three things have happened that bring out, more clearly still than the failure of the legislation, the truth of this contention that it was grounded on false principles. The first point is, that in these years there has been a growing conviction that the judgements of the Privy Council were, in fact, erroneous, and a growing disregard of them. Its view of the Ornaments Rubric is set aside, not only by the thousands of clergy who wear the Eucharistic vestments, but also by the still larger number—amounting probably to ninety per cent. or ninety-five per cent. of the whole body—who wear stoles, either black or coloured; and not only by the clergy, but by the bulk of the laity who support them in this disregard of the finding of the Court.

Secondly, the history of the "Lincoln Judgement," delivered by Archbishop Benson in 1890, is a further proof that the turn of the tide had come, and that the tide of aggressive legalism had begun to ebb. The Privy Council pronounced in favour of the competence of the Archbishop to hear the case in his own Court, though there was little precedent to be quoted for such a course, and it depended on those very Church principles which recently had met with but scanty recognition. Thereupon the Primate decided to hear the case, welcoming especially the opportunity of a suit that need not be vitiated in the eyes of Churchmen by its being of a piece with the ecclesiastical chaos created by Parliament. The pleas were heard independently of the decisions of the Privy Council, and the Judgement was pronounced independently of it: and the widespread satisfaction that this method of handling the matter caused was in itself proof of a widespread dissatisfaction with the state of things which the legislation of 1832, 1840, and 1874 had created. If further proof were needed, it is forthcoming in the fact that,

when an appeal was made by the prosecutors to the Privy Council, it excited comparatively little interest: the general public was inclined to regard the Archbishop's Judgement as having much more authority and finality about it than any Privy Council Judgement on such matters was likely to have: while those who were interested in the appeal belonged to the smaller circle of specialists who were only curious to see how far the Privy Council would go in deferring to the Judgement which it was nominally called upon to revise!

A third sign of the turn of the tide lies in the history of the passing of the Clergy Discipline Act of 1892. The Archbishop had made strenuous and successful efforts to get a Bill through Parliament to enable the Bishops to deal more summarily with criminous clergy: when, almost beyond belief, there was a real hope of its passing, the question arose as to the action of the Church in the matter. Convocation has repeatedly agreed to the principle, but this was not enough, if the measure was to proceed on the right lines, and the principles of the relation of Church and State were to be once again respected. In face, therefore, of much opposition from officials, though with the help and support of statesmen of the better sort, the Archbishop insisted on procuring Letters of Business for the Convocations, and on passing there a canon to the same effect as the Bill in Parliament. The action of the Church thus once again preceded the action of the Parliament in the matter, according to the old principles of the Constitution. A new and brighter era had begun, and Parliament had begun again to realize in the disciplinary sphere the truth which it had recently recognised in the liturgical sphere in the legislation

of 1871 and 1872, viz., that the initiative in such matters belongs to the Church rather than to itself.

VI.

Does Parliament seriously contemplate going back upon this at the beginning of the twentieth century? It would seem incredible, were it not that there is always a jealousy of Convocation in the parliamentary breast, that there is a strong Erastian body, a strong anti-clerical body, and a strong nonconformist section ready to unite against the rights and liberties of the Church; and were it not that there is actual evidence of this recrudescence in the fact that two private "Discipline Bills" have passed a second reading.

We have already in the first chapter considered the circumstances of the hour which account for this recrudescence, and also tried to estimate the amount of good reason that there is for the demand for better discipline in the Church, as well as to distinguish that sober and reasonable demand from the heated and panic-stricken state into which some minds have been thrown by a trend of ecclesiastical affairs which they are unable to understand; not because it is at all unintelligible, but only because they have not the requisites for forming a sober judgement upon it.

Let it be granted by all means that all is not satisfactory in the present ecclesiastical position. Let it be granted that there is a need of better facilities for Discipline. The point at issue is not as to the existence of such a state of things, but as to—(1) the true estimate of the magnitude and character of the evil: and (2) the proper way of redressing it.

As to the first of these. There can be little doubt that the want of discipline at the upper end of the

scale of churchmanship has been greatly exaggerated, while the want at the lower end has been greatly understated. It is commonly said in defence of this prevalent onesidedness that, because the upper end is the progressive end, there is more need of a curb for the head than of a stick for the tail. It is possible that this may be true as a statement of policy; but it is not so much policy that is in question as justice and truth; and these demand that defaulters at the lower end should have their fair share of blame.

Is it, however, so certain that, as a matter of policy, it is right to seek to discipline the ritualist rather than the latitudinarian or the puritan? Is it true, after all, that denial of the faith does less harm than ceremonial indiscretions or extravagances? Is the priest who deprives his people of many of their Services, mutilates many of those that he provides, and withholds from his flock the opportunities for confession and communion which their Prayer Book gives them a right to expect, less criminal than the priest who obtrudes confession on unwilling ears, or even supplies Additional Services which run beyond the likings of his people, or even the sanction of his Bishop?

The ecclesiastical situation cannot be understood without a recognition of the fact that the upper end of the scale is smarting from a sense of unjust treatment in this respect; and that, where men have gone into extravagancies, it has often been due to their feeling that in any case they despaired of having justice done to their point of view, after two or three generations of continual misrepresentation and injustice. Further, this is the reason why many less advanced men will not dissociate themselves from the more extreme men, though they regret their extravagancies; they feel that, until justice is done to the tenets which

they share with them, they must stand shoulder to shoulder with them, even at the cost of sharing the blame of a few things which they themselves disapprove. It is of no use to appeal to "old tractarians" to desert the ritualists, or to "the historic high Church party" to throw over the "Catholics." Until the rights have been secured, which are alike dear to both sections, there will continue to be alliance between them; in other words, if extreme views are to be repressed, moderate views must be more justly judged, and more generously welcomed.

Among the points on which these two sections are agreed, and in urging which they will not be divided, are these points now under consideration—the stickling for the right relation of Church to Parliament, the refusal of the Privy Council as an Ecclesiastical Court, the repudiation of a bastard church discipline, and the like. The hopeful way, therefore, of dealing with the present situation is not by repeating the blunders of the middle of the last century, and making another attempt at exercising a Parliamentary Church discipline. The whole of the history that we have reviewed shews this to be an expedient which is indefensible in theory and ineffective in practice. Rather it is by recognising that the contentions of high churchmen were just: that the recovery of true principles in the Discipline Act of 1892 was a valuable recovery, and forms a precedent that ought to be carefully followed in any future Acts of a similar character: that the essential first step in the recovery of the system of ecclesiastical discipline is the readjustment of the judicial system by the establishment with consent of the Church of a proper final Court of Ecclesiastical Appeal: that if Parliament is dissatisfied with the Convocations as being unsuitable or

inadequate representatives of the Church, it should, at least, recognise that they are better representatives of her than the modern Parliament is, now that it combines Scotch and Irish members as well as English, and those no longer necessarily churchmen or even christian: that, if they are inadequate, it is not the fault of the Church, which has been now for a long time trying to effect a reform, and has so far been hindered by the Government: that if episcopal control is insufficient, this is due to a large degree to the unwieldly size of dioceses, and this can hardly be made a fair matter of reproach by a Parliament which has let so large a part of its lifetime slip away without making any serious attempt to pass the Southwark Diocese Bill. Behaviour of this sort gives a strong Pecksniffian flavour to the protests that are from time to time emitted in the Commons with regard to the "crisis in the Church," and it would be far better if such protests ceased, and something were done to extricate the Church from the quandary into which the ineptitude of past Parliaments has landed it.

When the legislative system of the Church has been set in order by a recognition of the true principles of ecclesiastical legislation and by a reform of the Convocations, and the judicial system has been rescued from chaos by the establishment of a proper Court of Final Appeal, the Church will have two things essential to the efficiency of any body, both of which it now lacks, viz., the power to formulate its own opinion, and the power to enforce its decisions on its own members. There is no other self-respecting institution in the kingdom that would be allowed to be so crippled, bound, insulted, and scoffed at, as is the case with the Catholic Church of this country. This state of things cannot continue much longer; and if freedom is to be

purchased only at the cost of Disestablishment, the present situation is rapidly multiplying the number of churchmen who are prepared, not only to tolerate it, but to demand it, as a measure, which may be indeed a very bad bargain for the State, but has become imperative for the welfare of the Church.



THE CHURCH'S FAILURES
AND THE
WORK OF CHRIST



THE CHURCH'S FAILURES

AND THE

WORK OF CHRIST

A CHARGE

ADDRESSED TO THE CLERGY OF HIS DIOCESE

AT HIS SECOND VISITATION

IN THE NINTH YEAR OF HIS EPISCOPATE AND IN THE
YEAR OF OUR LORD

1903

BY

EDWARD

HUNDREDTH BISHOP OF ROCHESTER

London

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1903

All rights reserved

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED,
BREAD STREET HILL, E.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

Συνεργοῖς Συσστρατιώταις Συνδούλοις
ἐν Χριστῷ

I.

AGAIN, by the mercy of God, after four crowded years, I am allowed to address you from this throne.

To me they have been years of health and happiness, in my home, and in my work, made happy in my relations with yourselves by the strengthening of many a tie of mutual confidence, personal regard, and brotherly fellowship in experience and work.

To the Diocese they have brought little outward change. With the exception of the Chancellorship none of its higher offices have changed hands, Bishops, Dean, Archdeacons, Chapters of the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches remain the same.

What have the years brought to the great communities to which we belong, to this Church and Realm?

They brought the experience, discipline and suffering of War: and then the relief and blessing of Peace.

They brought the end of a great Reign: and we stood amazed while we told over to one another what it had been given to one woman of simple faith, sound sense, and sterling heart to do in the high place to which, by what men name chance, God called her at a crisis in English development, and in which He upheld her for sixty-four momentous years: and then while we went on to remember and recount the blessings of the Victorian age.

They brought, too, the end of a great life in the highest seat of the English Church, the life of one who came to it with the fire in his heart of a double zeal for World-Evangelisation and for a great moral reform, and had to spend two-thirds of his strength and

opportunity in patient encounter with controversy provoked by folly and pursued with bigotry.

But have the years brought a sense of genuine progress, of better understanding between the nations, of a clearer acceptance by England of her great vocation as the first Missionary power in the world? Have they seen the forces of Christian faith and simple duty concentrating themselves in more active and prevailing conflict with the dangers that beset all classes from luxury and self-indulgence, with the difficulties which threaten faith in an age when things temporal and visible are all-insistent, and with the burdens which lie heavy on the life of those who work with their hands?

Or have the years seen the dear Church of our own allegiance lengthen her cords and strengthen her stakes, grow surer of herself, more lovely in her people's eyes, more welcome for her work's sake to all?

I cannot be sure that you will give an affirmative answer—or that it ought to be given—to these questions. And the doubt which you share saddens our hearts.

I shall have them before me in what I try to say here, relieved by the habit of an annual Conference Address from some of the personal notices, and comments on current matters, for which you might otherwise look.

I shall say nothing here of the Education Question, tempting as it is to make some reply to the torrents of invective which represent us all, and especially the Bishops, in the light of brigands, who by a wanton attack at once on the settlement of 1870 and the liberties of their fellow subjects, have sought to enrich themselves at the expense of the State, and have plunged the country gratuitously into religious controversy. As though every one did not know that the settlement of 1870 had in the lapse of thirty years altered its whole proportions and effect, and was working to the slow and sure extinction of one of the two great classes of schools which it was designed to preserve. As though, too, the adjustment of claims between the great and permanent denominationalist and undenominationalist parties was not a matter for fair and honourable debate, as between mutually respecting opponents.

Nor shall I touch on the matter of prime concern for us, the

construction of the South London Diocese. You will know without my enlarging upon it, our unchanged determination to go forward with the enterprise, calling all hands to our aid, until it is crowned with success.

I subjoin to the Charge some tables which have been prepared for me to show how we stand, what we have been enabled to do and what we have left undone, in the matters of Church Extension and Church Education.

I return now to the main theme.

The impression is strong upon me that the time is one in which there is a sense in the air of trouble and failure, and in which we "see not our tokens" clear and unmistakable. I do not find anywhere as I look round purposes very definite or hopes very buoyant. The sense in Church and State of great responsibilities towards the world and towards our own people is much clearer than is the perception how they are to be discharged. We have lived through the inspiring times of great movements such as those of Reform, or Free Trade, or Slave Emancipation, of popular evangelisation and Church revival, and have come on into a drearier day of criticism and controversy. Energy has tried its experiments, zeal has made its ventures, experience has learnt and applied its lessons, and after all, we are tempted to say (for a temptation in part it is), things remain as they were, the old problems face us, the old alienation defies us: we have not bound up the wounds, we have not housed the people or won them to temperance, or, still less, kindled their loyalty to the great Redeemer and King.

I have used general words such as cover more than matters of religious and Church concern, and reach out over social and political life. But I have very specially in mind our own particular problem which is assuredly wide enough.

It did not need Mr. Booth's book to make us deeply dissatisfied with the relation of the Church to the working classes. Nor are we much more content with the way in which in the great and developing fields of knowledge or among those who govern and those who own, the witness of the Truth committed to us is either borne or received. It is comfort—if comfort at all—of the poorest and sourest kind to find that where we fail others fail too.

To look all this in the face is certainly well. We ought to be more, not less, conscious of it. We ought to be constantly turning these matters over in our thoughts. We ought to carry them with us into the prayers, public and private (such as those of our own noble Litany), which become true and Christlike as they grow large hearted and mindful of the general weal.

Such thoughtfulness and acknowledgment would mean the growth in us collectively, in clergy and laity alike, of a humble and seeking spirit: and this is the spirit which has the promises with it. The Pharisees—who are (be it ever steadily remembered) for the particular warning of us the religious professors of to-day—were neither humble nor seeking. They were content with their own development, and if they looked forward it was to the triumph of their own way *in* their own way.

Just so far as I know that I belong to a humble Church, a Church that owns and grieves with an open ear and a will to learn, I am of good hope, for such a Church is sure of blessing.

If in that temper we can face frankly all the facts of our failure, then we shall find, as it is wholesome for us to do, no little encouragement. Here are some grounds for it.

1. The temper of the workers themselves. They are not disheartened, and discouraged, and the best of them least. Can we imagine, for example, the men who have worked our College Missions writing the sentence in which Mr. Booth says:—"To the work undertaken they have brought enthusiasm and high hopes, but *only to meet disappointment*" ?¹

2. Everywhere where good work is put in there comes a measure of genuine return. And it comes in two forms in the gathering of small but devoted bands of faithful men and women, in whatever class: and in an amelioration of the whole tone of life around. The faithful may be very few, and much may remain very dark in the general life. But both results are real.

3. It will be said, and we must acknowledge, that the little bands are very few among the many. But before scoring this under the head of failure we may rightly ask what success we are encouraged

¹ *Religious Influences*, iv. p. 73.

to expect. Nothing in Scripture and little in experience would lead us to think that the majority in any class, time, or place will make Christian faith and principle their own. Appearances to the contrary are mainly due to pressure from authority or fashion. Where, as among many of our working classes, fashion and habit and even pressure are all the other way, a small result is well won and most real, though a critic may sum up in terms of failure.

4. That general bettering influence which we see in miniature in many a working parish and mission district, is also writ large in many features of our common life: and we need not ask too jealously how much of this is due to our own and other definitely Christian influences, sure that it is not only Christian in result, but mainly Christian in origin. For example, over-crowding is bad, but it is not quite so bad, on the whole, though worse in districts.¹ There is less drunkenness, and scenes which were common years ago would be impossible to-day.² Even in the worst slums brutality is less brutal. There is more activity on the part of local authorities, and more soundness in public opinion, in favour of measures against organised immorality.

Or, once more, if any one wishes to be sure that the work of God is worth doing among our people, let him invert the case, and he himself will shudder at the picture of what it would mean if Christian work in South London could be imagined absent or withdrawn.

In the midst of much which dishonours our Lord let us write up "the great main fact to which we have endless testimony that 'Christian people are nearly all temperate and thrifty' and the better in every way for being so."

But while I give these substantial reasons for encouragement (for mere depression is only disabling), I wish to face fully the reality and dimensions of our failure, and without more words about its nature and extent to consider a little what it means.

There is one thought in particular upon which I desire to-day to lay stress. It is obvious, and it is of the most far-reaching importance; but I do not notice that it is generally observed.

¹ "Considerably less crowding than ten years ago." "A considerable improvement in housing conditions on the whole," Booth, *Life and Labour*, Final Vol., p. 5.

² Booth, *ib.* 201; and Shadwell, *Drink, Temperance, and Legislation*, Chaps. II. and III. Longmans and Co., 1902.

³ Booth, *ib.*, p. 75.

The power of Jesus Christ works, I suppose, in two ways which perhaps I may conveniently name the *embodied*, and the *diffusive* manner.

So our Lord seemed to indicate. It works first as a net which gathers into its own circle; it forms a building built on a foundation. It calls to a discipleship, of open profession, with shining light, and with clear consciousness of its own distinctness from the world. And naturally this was the form which was historically most immediate and patent when the Lord left His people. There was the little flock, the company of them that believed, and they went out with the word on their lips, and the breaking of the bread for their tie with each other and with Him, to win one by one those whom, as they 'discipled' them, they gathered into the one body by the baptism and the laying on of hands through which each received his share in the covenanted Spirit. This is the *embodied* form of the Lord's work.

But (secondly), the Lord had also said that His power would act like leaven, 'hidden,' but working till the effect was visible upon the whole lump.

Naturally this, which is what I have named the *diffusive* influence, would be slower to appear. Yet we may recognise it behind those early and rapid admissions of thousands together of which we read in the Acts. For was not this the fruit of the Lord's own 'diffusive' work in many hearts which never accepted Him while He was on earth, reaped after He had left them by the leaders of His Body?

And from the start of the embodied work, this same diffusive result would begin and move on. It was not, for example, on Saul's mind alone that the demeanour of Stephen in life and death left, we may be sure, an unrecognised yet deep impression. It requires but little knowledge of society and history to assure us of the strong permeating invisible influence upon society at large of any body of men of clear thought, strong conviction, and disciplined conduct. At once many things respond to the magnetism: many are put on their mettle who would not for the world own it: many recognise their own best things more clearly in the new light shed upon them; there is instinctive moral competition. Such influence travels fast and far. You will remember the essay in which Bishop Lightfoot

discusses what Seneca owed to St. Paul. That was a question of definite intellectual and literary debt. But what of the debt which is in its nature impalpable? I have always myself believed that the later thought of the Roman world, the mellow stoicism of Aurelius and Epictetus in the second century, with its strong unexplained instinct for a personal and fatherly God, with its gentle and self-denying ethics, shows the tincture of the influence diffused through the thoughts and prayers, the quiet conversations or the dropped words and overheard phrases, or the bearing and countenance of a slave here or a friend there, known or perhaps not known to belong to that strange new body of people, with their foolish yet arresting faith, with their practices everywhere spoken against yet of such pure and winning charm,—who bore the name of the Nazarene.

There would be a like parallelism of the two forms of influence in each age; so that in a complete history of Christianity by the side of Ecclesiastical History, properly so-called, would run another chronicle of diffusive effect. But plainly that effect will not always maintain itself at the same level. In the Middle Ages, when all forms of good took ecclesiastical form, and with few exceptions there were neither teachings nor examples that were not in ecclesiastical guise, it was at a minimum. But the publication and printing of the Scriptures in the vernacular changed this at a blow, and the change was enhanced by the detachment of political from ecclesiastical life. The embodied force was weakened, and the diffusive gained wholly new channels of influence. Have we sufficiently remarked that this change has come to a height in our own time, or marked how much this involves? The embodied force is weakened; opinion is free: in big political states the spirit of personal independence is stronger than corporate spirit: manifold Christian division, and the weary and repulsive conflicts between the divided parts, prejudice outward Churchmanship in men's eyes; intellectual solvents make definite profession of belief more difficult. But meanwhile the diffusive force has been enormously strengthened. Christian sentiment, principle, and conduct are observed to be in large measure common to different bodies of Christians, and so in a manner they win a fresh testimony out of the very divisions which weaken the influence of corporate Christianity. Those who do not

accept the Gospel as a faith from heaven are, in a sense, the more ready to emphasise its character as a first-rate moral and spiritual force. The essentially modern power of re-interpretation (as, to take a single example, in "Ecce Homo") brings out anew, with stimulating power, the meaning of the Gospel story: each new movement, that is not essentially materialistic, cries openly or tacitly "Back to Christ," or appeals to some Christian principle. Even fiction delights in showing how Christian, in this or that trait of patience, compassion, or self-sacrifice, untaught and unaided forms of human life may be; and, deeper than all this, the whole of English life carries in its tissues the effects of fourteen centuries of Christian influence.

Thus it comes about that alongside of a discouraged and broken condition of the embodied force, the diffusive has never been so strong, or wielded such versatile and ready instruments. It is this to which I specially invite your attention, for I am persuaded that the more you reflect upon it the more you will realise its significance and its bearing upon many of our problems. It bears, for example, upon the popularity of undenominationalism, upon the church-going question, and upon the constantly reported indifference to organised religion.

The question then arises, what is the true relation between these two forces? Plainly they ought to be mutually contributive. The embodied force, besides directly governing the lives of the adherents, should have a penumbra of light in indirect and diffusive influence. The diffusive force, on its part, should be constantly preparing material which the body could absorb and build with. A good instance of this last may be given from our Indian Empire. There you will find our best missionaries impressed with the belief that direct or embodied Christian work can go forward but slowly, until by its own indirect effect, by the equity of English law, by the integrity of English courts, and the character for justice and mercy of English officials, diffusive Christian influence prepares and increases in native hearts that morale to which the Gospel can appeal. And with strict consistency they reckon no hindrance so great as that of unfaithfulness and unchristian conduct on the part of English Christians in India.

But while this is the proper relation between the two forms of Christian influence, they are quite certain to become in a measure first detached, then divergent, and finally in part antagonistic.

I believe that in this we have the secret of not a few tangles of our time.

Consider the combined effect of the following truisms :—

(1) Every inconsistency in a professed Christian, still more every unworthy Christian life, deducts from the repute of the Church, that is from the influence of the embodied Christian force.

(2) Every instance of character or sentiment or sacrifice due to what I have called diffusive Christian influence in the examples of non-Christians, or Christians unavowed, diminishes the clear light of distinction by which the embodied life of Christianity would be known in a Pagan world.

(3) Great bodies of thought, great streams of feeling, great movements of action may be found in which Christian leaven is plainly at work, but which stand in no acknowledged relation to embodied Christianity.

Then there is the converse case. An ecclesiastic myself, I spoke to you in my Primary Charge of the obvious and, as I think, urgent dangers of ecclesiasticism. They are the dangers, in other words, of the embodied force. In the face of Ecclesiastical History I need not spend words upon them: the dangers of attaching disproportionate importance to the institutional parts of religion, of mistaking traditions or habits for principles, of slowness in adjusting to changed conditions, of losing the direct, inevitable, and radiant connection between faith and goodness—in a word of cumbering, disguising, and even caricaturing the thing embodied by the embodiment which contains it. To which may be added whatever tendencies there may be to false professionalism in the clergy. All these things help to cloud the issue. The representatives prejudice what they represent, and no generation could be more sensitive to such drawback than one marked by the characteristics which I have tried to delineate in our own.

I need not say that diffusive Christianity has also its faults which you and I are not likely to underrate: and that their worst effect is to drive the men of organised religion in upon themselves

in recoil and scorn. For evidently what is diffusively Christian by its very nature shades off and grades down into what is not Christian at all: short of this, it is often capricious, shallow, and unbalanced in its forms: much of its teaching is washy and thin: it is apt to follow the line of least resistance in dealing with human wilfulness or laxity: it has little power to control, if it does not even flatter, individual self-assertion: it knows little of the mighty strength of spiritual discipline; it can wield very imperfectly the great forces of loyalty and corporate conviction. There is, I think, very good reason from the look of experience to doubt—and we who believe that the Lord created and commissioned His Church should be disposed to doubt it—whether the diffusive force does not owe its very existence at this late date to the Church from which it is often detached, and with which it is often scornfully contrasted. Without that there might have been a certain influence from Jesus as from other great teachers and characters in the far past. But the steady and unbroken witness was necessary to secure for Him a position and a hearing from men which none other receives: and the lives which are lived under the discipline of Christian allegiance and in direct dependence on grace, even though the number be comparatively few and their witness tarnished by inconsistency, are none the less an indispensable part of the leaven which leavens the world.

I spoke just now of the value to Missionary work in India of diffusive Christian influence. It is interesting to combine with this what Missionaries tell us of the value of Baptism, and its admission to the corporate life, as a test and touchstone disclosing the whole difference in a man between subtle and appreciative interest in Christian things, and a real acceptance of Christ. Do not let us have any doubt or fear about the value of corporate religion, of the embodied life.

Well, now, I would ask you, passing by the defects of my expression, to consider whether I have not characterised rightly the general position of things. I think it is as a whole unprecedented: full of tangle: full of dangers: but not certainly without its hopefulness.

Let us notice two characteristics of it.

The first is that it is largely a state of civil war, which is

deplorable: the second is that the forces on both sides are largely Christian, which is encouraging. It is deplorable to find the Christian forces conflicting together, in mutual ignorance and misunderstanding. But it is encouraging in a high degree to find that much of what we are tempted to regard as hostile is Christian in its own way; that not a little of it is due to that intense truthfulness and vitality in what is of Christ, which gives to Christian life in the sum its high self-correcting and self-renewing power: that thus, far more widely than we fancy, Christ reigns, and Christ is preached.

What, you may ask me, is the result of all this? What makes it worth while for the busy Bishop of a busy Diocese, with practical problems clamouring for solution, to dwell upon these abstractions?

1. Little difference, I answer, as to the lines we severally take, immense difference as to the way and the spirit in which we take them. For plainly, when there is so much that is Christian around us in many forms, we may easily make bad mistakes: we may merely denounce that from which in part we ought largely to learn: we may be fighting against God, when we think we are staunch in His cause. Our want of grip on certain classes, and certain movements, may come not from our being too Christian for them, but from our not being Christian enough in width as well as depth.

Plainly we shall professionally incline to attach disproportionate importance to all that concerns the embodied form of Christianity, though not for the reason which many would assign. It is not chiefly love of our institution, though no warmhearted man can belong to any institution, let alone a Church, without becoming something of a partisan. But the real reason, be it observed, is zeal or tenderness for individual salvation. For it is here that diffusive Christianity is weakest. It is not enough for the individual that he have some thoughts of Christian origin, or belong to some movement whose root impulse is Christianity: the question for him is whether the power of Christ lays hold of him so that he believes with his heart, and confesses with his lips, and accepts the grace, and therefore joins himself to those who do the like. We can never be content with less than this; not to make one proselyte, not to add a unit to the figures of our institution, but to secure one more who is given to Christ, accepts Him *sans façon* as Master and Lord, and seeks a share

through the Spirit in His Life. And so this is no exclusive bigotry of the Church, but it is shared by other Christian bodies—notably such an one as the Baptists—who know that membership is the general method and safeguard of personal conversion.

Nor is it possible to make too much of this, to pray and watch and work for it too carefully, unless it makes us wrongly exclusive of other ways by which Christ works in man, and man accepts His work. It was the logical extreme of such exclusiveness when men in other days could only set forth the Name by which we are to be saved by combining with it the belief that none but baptised Christians could be saved. See it in Dante. Read in Parkman's thrilling accounts of early Jesuit work in Canada, how they would risk life and torture for the sake of one moment in which, without a mother's knowledge, they could pour a drop of water with the Holy Name on some unconscious wigwam infant—and you will see what moral power that motive could wield. Yet we shrink in horror from it in that form. And I suppose a recognition, franker than we always put into words, of the manifold ways by which God brings many through the One Christ to Himself, may, without relaxing pastoral zeal, prevent the pastor from being utterly crushed and heartbroken by the extent of his failure.

2. The call to us then is not to believe and teach with less conviction and fervour what we have believed and taught, but to combine more with it; to see that out of context it may lose much of its power, attractiveness, and witness; it may become less recognisable by men. The great evangelical truths of Christ's work for us men and for our salvation, can never cease to be the foundations of faith and the motives of conversion. The sacredness of the Church as the Body of Christ, the value of her means of grace, the guidance given by her witness, can never change. But we may see how our constant insistence on these things may seem something like patter to a man who perhaps is an outsider to them all, but has some imperfect glimpse of the beauty of Christianity as a power that should make for brotherhood and mutual service. Even though the spiritual force of our preaching may besiege his conscience on one side we may quite fail to bring up that whole power of appeal which would capture the man.

3. I think this may also affect our hopes of the future, which count for so much in giving aim and force to our work. Rome looks for the time when all a misguided and rebellious world shall gather itself back in submission and loyalty; and in different ways others have like ideals of some common recognition of truth in its Catholic fulness or Evangelical simplicity, as they understand those words.

But to me it seems impossible not to recognise that if God should in His mercy have in the vista of the future a dispensation of victory and unity for His visible kingdom, it must come about by some much larger drawing together of the forms, both embodied and diffusive, in which His truth is now working in the world. It will be, we believe, in a City, but in one of which the "gates will be open day and night that men may bring into it," in many forms and senses, "the forces of the Gentiles, and that their Kings may be brought"; it will be through a revealed truth of the living and eternal Christ, but a truth to which from a hundred sides will have come contributions of interpretation and illustration.

For our own Church I would only keep a humble hope that in working towards such a consummation, near or far, she may have her own part. She does not yet know that sharp contrast between Clericalism and Secularism which cuts like a knife across the delicate links by which embodied and diffused Christianity ought to be intertwined.

And the boldness of her recognition of the double duty of retaining and revising, of loyalty to the unchanging, and of harvesting from change, full of danger and delicacy as it is, must surely, if she keep herself humble and Spirit-seeking, give her singular advantage for such a task.

If for some such large end we all severally direct in our little spheres our tiny efforts, none can tell how much riper and mellow our own religion would become, or how much more spell it would wield of attraction and appeal.

II.

IN the previous part of this Charge, I started from those facts of failure on the Church's part, of alienation and indifference towards religion which have been lately brought into public discussion, but which daily life has long made familiar to most of you.

I indicated briefly some reasons for encouragement and against depression.

But I did not dwell upon these, being anxious to face the main issue of which I did not attempt to disguise the gravity.

With this in view I emphasised a single line of thought, to which I can now only refer in words too brief perhaps to be intelligible.

There are two ways in which Christianity is manifested to the world: one the embodied way, through 'the Body or Society of His pledged believers': the other the diffusive way, by which influences from Him spread out without limit into the life and thoughts of men. In Our Lord's own words one was figured by the net and the building: the other by the leaven. Both are essential and permanent. They ought to be entirely allied; the embodied force ever acting with fresh leavening power as the influence of the Christian Society communicates itself to all the life around it; the diffusive force providing ever fresh material upon which the Body can lay hold, and build up into itself.

But the two may largely diverge: and may even become in a measure antagonistic: as happens, for example, whenever for the sake of something learnt, knowingly or unknowingly, from Christ, a man or a movement clashes against corporate Christian teaching or practice, though not without some compensation in the fact that those who seem enemies have in Christ more unity than they know.

Quite plainly any such clash would be in a high degree confusing and bewildering, since it must have the character of civil war: yet it would have its encouraging aspect, since on each side there would be much that was Christian, and probably more a good deal than the other would allow.

And I made it my point that such a clash was eminently characteristic of our own time, for the double reason that while the one force, the embodied Christian life, carries with it all the disfigurement and mutilation (much larger than we professing Christians recognise) caused by ecclesiastical and clerical and Christian narrowness, or laxity, or pretension, or bigotry, or divisions in the past, the other or diffusive force has unprecedented vogue and attraction. For amidst all the evil and materialism there never was a time when there was so much sentiment, philanthropy, corporate and mutual service, inspired by Christian influence, when there was so much broken light of Christian source as there is to-day, or when it expressed itself with anything like so much freedom and variety.

I find in this a very real help in analysing that with which we have to deal, viz., a time with so much religiousness, and so little definite religion; a time of real moral progress in so many ways along with so much depreciation of those truths and practices of belief and worship and membership which to Christians embody the great secret and centre of moral growth: a time alarming and yet tantalising, too, to the believer, who finds as it seems to him so little of his belief, and yet so much of what should naturally spring from it, or respond to it.¹ I must not dwell further on this now.

But I go on to ask to-day two questions.

I. What ought to be the special character of Christian teaching in such a time?

II. What special difficulty will such teaching encounter?

¹ I think I observe a similar feeling on the part of one of our most thoughtful and distinguished Nonconformist neighbours in South London work, Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, Warden of the Bermondsey Settlement, expressed in some words of the preface to his valuable book on *The Fatherhood of God* (T. and T. Clark, 1902): "Many are greatly perplexed by the seemingly rival claims of spiritual work, and of the motives of natural and generous sympathy. It is of great importance to seek a reconciliation between the two."

I. My answer to the first is that it should be teaching which lays stress on the central position of Christ and His Truth.

Or I may use other words and say that it should be teaching which sets Christ and His Truth in as large as possible a context.

I must ask you to take this in abstract form, hoping to make it clearer as I proceed.

A contrast may help me to do this. Suppose a preaching which offered religion in some such terms as the following: "Here is a Creed for you to accept, here are practices with which it is your duty to comply. There is nothing in history that is related to them: nothing in philosophy that points to them or responds to them. There is no need that they should commend themselves to your conscience or to your thoughts: they have no relation to your other ideals, aspirations, or experiences; for all these are human and this is Divine." This would be a religion without context.

Plainly such an offer would be in sharpest contrast with the Gospel of Christ: an egregious contrast to the whole Gospel effected by a caricature of one aspect of it, viz., its unworldliness and unlikeness to human wisdom.

Accordingly just so far as any teaching approximates to this it will be wrong, and it will fail. "Approximates," or seems to approximate, for I am certain that we do not realise how often religious teaching wears in the eyes of many just this appearance. How much pious reiteration of the words of salvation by faith, how much recurring emphasis on the duty of sacramental partaking has had this distant and aloof sound in the ears of many and many a hearer. Like the speaking with a tongue to which St. Paul refers, it might mean to the speaker what was blessed and spiritual and true, but not being interpreted it has not edified, and perhaps has suggested that he himself lacked understanding. Such contrasts may guide us to a more adequate estimate of what I have called the central nature of Christian truth and its relation to human context. Plainly this is of its essence, as a truth of Incarnation. Doctrinally this means that human things culminate in the Divine revelation, which finds in them its instrument and its language. Historically it meant, and indeed means, that men were drawn to Him along the

lines of human purity, human penitence, human admiration, friendship, and discipleship.

Consider in this connection that most characteristic word of Scripture—*fulfilment*. Fulfilled in Christ. Christus Consummator. The word is many-sided. He fulfils the past: not only by the correspondence between some act and title of His and the words of an inspired writer in the past, but with much richer meaning, by His being more fully, more ideally, by His being finally, what 'in many parts, and in many manners,' others had been and said and suffered and done. His fulfilment of what was Israel's is the typical and leading case, enshrined for us in Scripture, but it did not stand alone. Greece and Rome brought the 'desirable things,' gained from their achievements and their failures, into the new House of God. But so also it must be, not only in these races and at the historical moment of the Incarnation, but on a larger and world-wide scale. It is not too much to say that a real faith in the Name of Jesus as the one Name, in the Gospel as the one religion, would be impossible if we did not believe that the distinctive and partial elements of truth and character in the different races would find summary and centre in Him and in His Truth. We think we see for our encouragement how, for example, man and woman, Eastern and Western, the men of freedom and vigour and the men of patience, find their spring or completeness in Him, or are mirrored in some aspect of His. The noble records of Missionary work are constantly yielding new instances of this.

But of this, too, how little is actively and intelligently realised by our people, with the consequence that the truth which they believe shines with far less glory, and kindles in them far less devotion, than is its due.

Have you preached on that seeming difficult but really simple 87th Psalm ('Her foundations are upon the holy hills'), so wonderful as mere prophecy, so rich as interpreted of Christ?

It makes what I mean clearer yet, if we recognise that in the region most familiar to us, that of ordinary moral and spiritual teaching, all our best effectiveness comes in this way. For how much of this consists in tracing for men in their own circumstances, in their

inward or outward experience, the applications and 'fulfilments' of the teaching and example of Christ. We recognise a conspicuous example of this in St. Paul's treatment of the Cross and the Resurrection of Christ. They were to him first facts, and this is essential to the rest: but then typical facts: and as typical facts they became master-principles and keys of life. Everywhere he found them interpreting experience and verified in experience.

Are our young men in their self-conquest, as well as our poor in their patience, our bereaved in their sorrow, and our sick in their pain taught thus to recognise their part in the unity of the Cross and Resurrection? For then these Truths will be alive for them.

Thus it is that in manifold ways, among every class, and in every time, Christ stands in context with human life: and so He must be exhibited if men are to be won.

I pray you to recognise that these two truths of fulfilment in Christ and of what I called His diffusive force combine with, and complement, one another. For taken together they mean, so to speak, that the lines run inward from all life into Him and outward from Him into all life.

I would urge you with passionate earnestness so to study Christ in this double context with the life of the race in which He was incarnate, and so to present Him to men. For assuredly so must His claim address itself to many a conscience and mind.

Do not let me damage this by seeming to forget what is against it, or beside it. I am not, for example, blind to the harm that may be done by crude attempts to find witness to Christ in history, philosophy, science, experience, by those who have no real knowledge of the great subjects which they touch. Nor do I forget that there are those to whom paradox is attractive, or who are out of humour with life, or tired of its strain, and that to such people the very charm of their religion is that it is something altogether apart from, and in contrast to, life. Perhaps we may see an instance of this in the wish to hear nothing from the pulpit on Sunday that reminds men of the affairs of the week, even though it be to throw upon those affairs the light of Christian principle and duty.

Again, it may be objected that it is the very characteristic of the Cross and of its guidance to reverse and not to fulfil man's wisdom:

or that the Beatitudes in like manner are a Divine reversal of natural morality. Yet is this really so? Is not the Cross the Divine fulfilment of what is seen in every really noble deed of rescue or patriotic sacrifice? And is not the fact that the wolves are gone and the sheep thrive in England, an instance to show that nature in her dumb way anticipates the truth that the meek possess the earth?

Or once more—and this is far the most important matter, let me not for a moment seem to slight that other aspect of Christian Truth, in which it stands by itself, as Christ Himself stood, like yet unlike to those about Him, a man, yet like no other man that ever spoke or lived. Anything which tampers with the uniqueness of Christ, or reduces it to a uniqueness of degree, touches the very heart of our faith. Anything which suggests that He is the mere product and yield of the natural conditions of the time when He lived would rob us of what is vital. We may indeed hesitate as a matter of language to use the word supernatural, knowing that it suggests to many mere arbitrariness, but to that which the word was meant to convey, we must hold fast. It is what is expressed in picture-words by saying that “for us men and for our salvation He came down from heaven.” He comes to us out of the being of God Himself, and He brings with Him powers which belong to some higher plane in God’s great universal order. This it is which the Creed of the Church preserves for us.

But I would urge that we realise this uniqueness, this revealed glory of new creation in Our Lord, most clearly, and most persuasively by far to others, when we set Him in our thought, where He set Himself, in the midst of human life, revealed first at a point in history and always a living centre to all things good and true and beautiful in men. Then it is that travelling up to Him along the lines of what prepares for Him, or tends towards Him, or is most nearly like to Him, the wonder and even the contrast of what He is bursts most convincingly upon us. It is perhaps worth while to remind you that there is analogy for this (imperfect of course, but real) in experience. There is a faint likeness of it in every appearance of the mystery which we call genius in human life. There are points in scientific evolution, such as the first appearance of life or of consciousness, when practically a new thing appears, albeit rooted in the past.

And there is even some faintest suggestion of the same thing in the general law of chemistry that "a compound of two substances is something more than the sum of those substances, and is in a proper sense a different substance."¹ I only suggest that there are here signs in God's whole work of a method according to which He could, as it were, breathe new power or quality into His created work; and that this method received a unique and transcendent application when the Word of God Himself was made flesh, born of a woman, of the seed of Israel, yet a holy Thing who was what no birth from woman or race could approach to explain.

It is when we see most plainly how the Lord is Saint among the saints, and Martyr among the martyrs, that we recognise most confidently that He is what neither saint nor martyr ever was, and own Him to be their King and Saviour as well as ours. When in such ways we come to feel the gathered and convergent strength of the witness to Christ, we can deal more fairly and less apprehensively with the questions of criticism, in themselves so difficult, and can approach with far best effect such a point as the Birth of our Lord, because we see it, and place it, as the early Christians did, in proportion and perspective, not a cardinal proof, not a primary element in the *proof* (note the word) of the Incarnation, but an incident or feature wholly suitable and (as it increasingly seems to myself) necessary to that great wonder, that mighty sign, that open revealing, which the cardinal doctrine of the Incarnation declares.

I have travelled, in following out this thought of fulfilment, a little off my main track. But I may return to it by reminding you that my first question was: What ought to be the special character of Christian teaching in a time like ours? and that I have found as an answer that it should be such as brings out that central character of Christ and His Truth, to which the word fulfilment points.

I could illustrate the need in many ways. I doubt, for instance, whether most people in the least realise how the men of art and the men of science habitually look upon us, the men of religion, as concerned with something altogether aloof, and felt by us to be aloof, from the things which interest them. Don't let us flatter ourselves

¹ Lester Ward, *Pure Sociology*, p. 80.

and despise others, by thinking that this is only a respectful fear on their part of that which is "not of the world." It is in large measure a very different kind of alienation. Yet a very few steps of thought upon revelation or upon the religious faculty in man, and we find ourselves as Christians in closest touch with what art means. Or is it conceivable that if God be indeed what we believe, and man (as he surely is) one of God's animals, and built of His clay, Science and all its vast and marvellous wisdom can be a negligible quantity for Christian thought?

Or, again, take those forms of thought whose vogue and influence try the patience of the Christian to-day—I mean the various shapes of Christian Science and its like. To any philosopher their philosophy is a mere travesty, as Miss Carta Sturge¹ patiently shows; and to any scientist their science: common sense is offended by their wilful blindness to plain fact: the instructed Christian knows that their teachings are inconsistent with his faith, and disloyal to the Lord. But while we repel them as "erroneous and strange doctrine," and earnestly warn our people against them, do we ask what is the good in them which helps them to lay hold? What is the fault in us which helps their vogue?

I put the question to a thoughtful woman, an attached member of our Church, and a teacher of many in it, who has had good opportunities of observation.

This is the substance and in part the words of her answer.

They remember that joy is one of the first elements in the fruit of the Spirit: that God makes His chosen people joyful: and "a depressed Christian Scientist would be a contradiction in terms."

They "translate Religion into a direct and colloquial language which makes it feel of immediate moment." There are young people who have perhaps passed with dutiful acquiescence through preparation for Confirmation: and go dutifully to the Lord's Table as part of what they are told is Christian: but whose ideas of religion, if they spoke out, would prove to be that it is rather a dull instruction in being good, coupled with an account of what we are expected to believe. Then perhaps they come across in one of these new teachings what seems to them a real vitality of faith and hope:

¹ *Truth and Error of Christian Science*, M. Carta Sturge. (Murray, 1903.)

without having ever had a taste of the interest which there is in true theology rightly taught, they find a teaching which opens to them fascinating possibilities of transcending the things of sense and the prose of common life.

It would have been different, my friend says (and I ask you to observe how this accords with my own argument to-day), if they had been taught "in simple books, the inevitableness (and omnipresent underlyingness so to speak) of the Incarnation."

Once again, we hear much now of the importance of definite, and ever more definite teaching. So far as this means the application of the very best methods of skilled teaching to the highest of all subjects, it is good. I have myself expressed sympathy with it by the encouragement which I have given to some of our clergy who have tried, with great labour and devotion, to accomplish by the method known as "the Catechism," something more than the hazy and amateur results of much Sunday School teaching. But there is another side to the matter. If our teaching is to be lucid, let us seek that it be also luminous, 'throwing light' on life where people need it and can therefore recognise and welcome it: attractive as light is by its own radiance and by the way in which it lights up. For this is, in an emphatic sense, the character of His Truth, who came to be, and is, the "Light of the World."

But this matter of Gospel and context touches us yet nearer home: and we shall find one of its gravest applications if we turn, in such time as remains, to my second question.

II. "What special difficulties will be encountered by such teaching as I have suggested?"

They will, plainly, be such as seem to touch the heart of it, by obscuring the witness to Christian life borne by its context.

Is it not in some such direction that our experience in South London and elsewhere is pointing with emphatic gesture to-day? I ask you this as men of faith. We believe firmly in the Lord's promise of power for His work faithfully done. If, then, in answer to great efforts of faith and prayer on the part of the Church and of other Christian bodies we are met by what is admittedly a great poverty of result, and especially of the result which we most seek, that of thorough, converted, convinced, worshipping believers: and

if with some differences this besets alike different methods of work among ourselves and those of other Christians, would it not seem that the God of our faith is compelling us to *think*, to look deeper for the causes of what is at first this baffling contrast between His promise and the result.

Are they to be found in part in the context which is common to all forms of Christian work?

Can we discern such causes?

Perhaps the answer is closer to hand than we think. What are for any ordinary man the main parts of the context of his religion? Are they not chiefly these three: his scenery: his home: and his work?

The close connection between these and religion is known to us all, but it is even closer than we know. Begin to impress the elements of religion, and you will find yourself borrowing from these your readiest, most significant, most indispensable illustrations. We may be further sure of this from seeing that our Lord so taught; taking His subjects from fields and flowers, and the treatment of animals, or from the work in the vineyard, and the household, and the merchant's office, or again, from the home relations of the father and his sons, the parent and the child.

Now where are these three to-day? It is as much as we can do to get multitudes of our people a chance of knowing, by a few hours' experience, that there is such a thing as Nature's face and voice. Even the things that we have in the town—the sunshine, the air, the sky—how little we have of them, how little we know of their various and radiant power. What would you know of the stars if you had never seen them out of London?

But home is nearer to us than nature, and fuller yet of human and therefore divine meaning. I have a profound respect for the homes of our poor, and I do not forget this when I ask what have the character of the housing, the long hours and distance of labour, the independence and licence of the street-playing children, the public-house as a relief, and the absence of other relief, for the man and alas! the woman from the narrow squalor indoors—what have these done with the home, with its decency, its orderliness, its snugness, its sacredness, its discipline, its unity?

And then the work. How various are the conditions under which work is done, and what platitudes we talk when we neglect the differences and talk comprehensively either of the slavery of toil, or of its wholesomeness and dignity! Go to the sociologist, and he will tell you that man has in him the "instinct of workmanship," and no natural repugnance to labour, and that through labour comes wholesomeness of body and mind. Let us recognise this far more fully than we do. The great French preacher Lacordaire, out of the heart of his ecclesiastical system, discussing the salvation of the many or the few, declared that a great mass of mankind would find their salvation through toil.¹ But there is another side to the matter; the sociologist will also tell you² that "compulsory exertion in the form of excessive and protracted labour blunts and stunts all the faculties,"—and our appeal is to one of the most sensitive and delicate of those faculties, man's moral and spiritual sense! In the 'labour' of to-day, the instinct of workmanship, the pride of performance, the craftsman's keen interest in his work, the sense of opportunity and responsibility play, it may be feared, proportionately a painfully small part; and when we have made the most of the blessings of drudgery and of occupied hands, we must still feel that this heavy mechanical overstrain of task-work yields but little of that which should quicken and instruct the best instincts of man and draw his heart to God.

To these three, a man's surroundings, his home, and his work—may I add a fourth? his society. For surely not only a man's personal comrades, but the standard and organic vitality, as I may call it, of the life around him, are all-important to what he is and is capable of being. Now, in the life of the poorer parts of the town we observe, in this respect, two great drawbacks. (1) The economic sifting process has thrown together in masses those who are, by no fault of their own, our least civilised people. The best results of the nation's long moral and Christian history in refined character and noble living are beyond the touch, beyond the view, of many thousands. "We live by admiration," the poet says. What

¹ Lacordaire, *Conférences de Notre Dame*. No. 61.

² *Pure Sociology*, by Lester Ward, p. 289.

have these poor people had to admire? Those who should set the standard are elsewhere.

(2) There is, at least comparatively, a great lack of the habit of co-operation. Union, membership, mutual responsibility, and the brotherly spirit which draws men together, are not strong among us. All the "causes," political or industrial, which depend on habits of the kind make this complaint. Those who can compare London with the great industrial towns of the North find a great difference in this respect. Deeper poverty, closer crowding, want of local feeling, distance and variety of labour, a population largely drawn as units from all points of the compass into structureless masses, are, perhaps, causes of this, but so it is. We are dull if we do not see that Christianity, with its essentially corporate character, with its demand for mutual care and service, with its exaltation of love of the brethren, must be at a disadvantage with a population not accustomed to these things.

Christianity at the first made way by slipping itself in among the clubs or "colleges" of the Empire. In the Middle Ages it was in close touch—as our modern word guild may remind us—with the organisations for regulated partnership in commerce or trade. I myself have seldom experienced a happier sense of genuine and wholesome religion than when I went through the forms of admission to a Lodge of Oddfellows.

I am far from meaning to say that men are made Christians by joining trades unions, co-operative societies, lodges, or social clubs. These things may often be competitors with us for men's interests. But I do say that these things are embodiments of a principle which is essentially Christian. They form, I feel sure, a better and more congenial context for direct spiritual Christian effort than does a population which is too tired, or listless, or individualistic, to have a taste for any of these things.

Religion comes largely as a foreign thing. There is the dumb or articulate sense that its demands are like exotics for which a place is asked in a soil that does not permit their growth. And it must be added that if our poor people lift their eyes (as they do) and, looking beyond their immediate surroundings, consider the social order as a whole, it is not likely in their eyes to point very evidently Christ-

wards. It is difficult to express oneself at once accurately and briefly in a matter of the kind, but it may perhaps be fairly said that a society of which the lump was leavened with Christian leaven would be in a true sense a socialist society, whether by the socialism of law and structure, or by the nobler socialism of a society in which each, according to their power, acknowledged and discharged their responsibility for all. How great a contrast the social order of to-day presents I dare not try to say; but one may believe that, in the sight of God, what offends most is not any darkness and badness of South London, but the attitude towards it of so many of those who enjoy to the full England's luxury and wealth, and the profits of her gigantic commerce.

I do not forget the other side—the vast fabric of philanthropy; the many golden threads worked into our canvass by the lives of individual men and women who come among us from brighter places; and now the organised work of municipalities and of education. Thank God for these. Doubtless without them His judgment would have come upon us through revolution. Just so far as they go, they make all that is bright and hopeful in our picture. Yet we of South London know the vastness of what is undone, and that the Christian conscience of individuals and the public life of the community need to make effort on an altogether different scale if the weight is to be lightened which crushes the higher faculties of the people's life, and if the contrast between the name and the reality of a Christian nation is not to be a silent but powerful enemy to Christian effort.

This may be the place of a word of caution. Every great truth tends, through our infirmity, to be recognised most readily in its less lofty forms: and in particular, language shows us the specific way in which the great "Charity" that is of Christ is narrowed and belittled. It ought to avouch itself by every kind of brightening influence upon the lives of men: it tends to reduce itself to money-giving. How pathetic and how anxious is the interest of what Mr. Booth's book brings out in this connection. Men have felt, what I have sought to urge, that Christianity must have its practical credentials, must come with a context to men, if it is to be received. They have remembered how the Lord found 'signs' of Himself in

works of bodily relief. And so they have tried to take a moral short-cut to men's hearts by making a Christian Church or mission a centre of relief, of meals and doles. It is not for me to sit in judgment and say when and how the line has been crossed which divides good result from harm. But when we look at the matter in the mass it is written plain and large in Mr. Booth's pages that this association of temporal advantage with religion has become (partly under the harmful stimulus of religious competition) a most serious hindrance to that which it was intended to advance. There may no doubt be two sides of the account, and hearts may be softened and won by the palpable proof that religion means sympathy. But it is a very grave evil that to quantities of self-respecting people the profession of religion should be made suspicious and repulsive by their experience or belief that it commonly means a quest of advantage. The Church, as a whole, is evidently not the chief offender in this respect. But in places our work is tarnished in this way. No wonder and small blame when one thinks of the poverty and suffering and the difficulty of withholding anything that can be given. And yet we must be true to our best light. I cannot follow this farther now. But I have introduced the matter at this point, because I read in it, in the good purpose and in the large failure, a witness to men's sense of the principle on which it is my present business to insist, but their difficulty in giving it legitimate effect. We have tried to make up by money for the absence or arrears of witness to Christ which the slow and sure work of a fuller "charity" ought to have wrought out in the context of men's lives.

I feel, as I end, that you will ask me what I have contributed, how I have helped you in any sense in your arduous task.

I can only answer (most keenly conscious how slight and poor an answer it is) that I have tried to contribute to the work of interpretation, and that interpretation is no small part of the Church's duty in this, or indeed in any, age. The work of interpreting is humble work, for it implies a consciousness of our need to disentangle and learn and understand: it is sympathetic work, for it shows our desire to see with the eyes and feel with the hearts of those for whom we work. But through its humility and its sympathy it may

find a blessing. The best interpretation of to-day's position must show much to daunt, but it will save us from the deep discouragement which comes from thinking that all our difficulties are due either to the perversity of our people, or to our own want of faith and zeal. For it will reveal how much is due to deeper causes, which can only be slowly changed. We shall be less surprised if we see that, like missionaries among distant races, we have come to people speaking a language imperfectly understood. For the things which supply the dialect of Christianity with its most congenial and forcible expressions, are to many dim, blurred, and unfamiliar.

But courage, my brothers! we must maintain our present effort with every atom of our energy, for we cannot tell when other forces will undermine present obstacles or bring relief to us from the flanks.

The battle is the Lord's; the time and manner of the victory—whether or no it be across intervening spaces of seeming defeat—are in His Hands alone.

III.

I HAVE spent two thirds of the small space which the limits of a Charge allow, in considering what is to my mind the most urgent topic for the Church's self-scrutiny in our own time, viz., her own failure to draw men through herself to her Master. I submitted some considerations which may in part explain it, and in part light our path in seeking for remedy and improvement.

In what remains I desire to deal briefly with some of the details of the Visitation, and in such time as I can save to return to the main subject, and suggest one other topic of a general sort which has I think a very serious bearing on our future hopes.

I thank you for your replies to my questions. I have spent many hours upon them : I have not I hope overlooked any suggestion and I have derived much useful information. You on your side will I feel sure recognise that Visitation questions are not all mere enquiries, but that some though not all of them are intended to be at least suggestive of improvement.

Only on this ground can the question which I put upon a matter of your own personal method in one department of spiritual life, claim your patience for its almost intrusive character. I put it with the feeling that a Bishop's questions, if directed only to administrative and disciplinary matters, may convey the impression that these exhaust the practical relations between him and his clergy. I beg you to accept my special thanks for your answers to it. They show much effort to meet the demand upon him who teaches that he should think and learn. The record is honourable. Many put their questioner to shame.

Some acknowledge that reading of sermons excludes all "dis-

interested " study and meditation, and will I hope make a fresh effort to remedy this. It was a wise warning which Mr. Spurgeon gave to his students against the "temptation to ministerialism," "the tendency to read the Bible as ministers, to get into doing the whole of our religion as not ourselves personally but only relatively concerned in it."

The habit of some in taking up a particular topic or part of Scripture for continuous study of some weeks or months may be a useful hint to others. May I define our aim more clearly by saying that there should be, alongside of one another, some spiritual 'exercise in the law of the Lord' and some study, and that these though they interchange and overlap are yet distinct. Let a great teacher of the clergy, the late Dr. Vaughan, say it to us in words which have been recalled to me by one of yourselves.

"One slight help may be found in a resolute division of our Scripture reading into three kinds and methods. Let me suggest that we keep our devotional study of the Bible altogether distinct from the critical study on the one hand, and from the ministerial study on the other. We find our devotional reading sadly marred and neutralised by the perpetual intrusion, even when we are upon our knees, of the thought, 'Would not this verse make a good text?' A sweet and comforting breath of the Holy Spirit upon our own soul is thus corrupted into a sort of appliance and convenience for ministering: and thus the clergyman, who doubly wants the feeding and watering of his own soul, has but half the chance of other people for getting it. It is well, I think, when we are trying to get personal good from the Bible, to repel, almost as a temptation, the inclination to that sort of side look, of which I have spoken, to its possible use for texts and sermons."¹

I think that to some these words of one of our veterans may also be of use: "I find that for simply *devotional* purposes the reading of the text of Holy Scripture regularly is more helpful than the study of it with commentaries." I think this is true: but there must have been, and still be, the study.

In another way, the question about definite enquiry as to the

¹ *Addresses to Young Clergymen*, pp. 36 and 37, Dr. Vaughan. (Macmillan & Co., 1875.)

Baptism of Confirmation candidates was a hint. I knew it to be important, by the testimony of careful men as to the number of unbaptised whom they had thus discovered. As a result of your replies, I would urge upon all something more definite and satisfying than a mere "Yes" to the question "Were you baptised?" But I do not press for the requirement of formal and certificated evidence. In cases of doubt it will be desirable. But in ordinary cases, it is needlessly irksome to all concerned, and sometimes expensive.

On the other hand I cannot press as a hint the question about the time of the administration of Holy Baptism. It is plain that modern conditions are too strong for any general compliance of a literal character with the rubrics on the subject. But the principle behind those rubrics is so essential that I am glad to see that you make efforts to save it. One Baptism of adults in the year before your fullest congregation, with a short and impressive address upon it in the place of the ordinary sermon, and suitable hymns is, or would be, a parochial event of a really eloquent and instructive kind, leaving you a good conscience in conducting most at least of your infant baptisms at less important times, and without many present, though always, I hope, without slovenliness or patter, and with the full service.

The answers about extra services, and alterations in the Order of Holy Communion witness to a very high standard of discipline in these matters. I find practically no unsanctioned services in use, and very few cases in which the Order of Holy Communion is mutilated or altered. The omission of certain features, such as the Gloria Excelsis at particular celebrations, finds no allowance in the Prayer-Book which adopts (whether too rigidly or no men will differ) the plan of an unchanging order, and has no sanction in any case from me. I think there is hardly any instance of it left. To a few who (I think by inadvertence) had not complied with the request in my Primary Charge for the entire disuse of the practice of leaving out on certain occasions the first half of the shapely and close-knit Liturgy, I have addressed private requests, and have met with the most cheerful and prompt obedience. Only one incumbent, I regret to say, has positively declined to comply with this simple and necessary direction of his Bishop.

With regard to the much smaller point of the omission of the Ten Commandments, of which there are rather more instances in the case of frequent daily celebrations for busy people, I must content myself with again saying here that I cannot think this is often necessary. To obey will generally be worth more than to save two minutes. I was present myself the other day at a celebration when they were omitted. If the officiant had been ready to begin when the clock struck, the Commandments might have been used and the service concluded quite a minute sooner than was the case.

The question, repeated this time, as to the celebration of the Holy Communion for the Sick, brings out of course a defective use by many of our people of this most precious privilege of the very sick, the chronic sufferers, and the dying. It is a part bequeathed to us of the neglect in lax and cold days of the second and greater Sacrament of the Gospel. But I see, as was to be expected, that this is everywhere recognised, and, where work is efficient and circumstances permit, effectively recognised, as a part of pastoral duty. In three or four cases I found that the practice of communicating the sick from the Church instead of by a separate celebration, to which I thought it right to give some toleration a few years ago in my address to the Conference, had been used as the only method of those parishes to the exclusion of the method of the Prayer-Book. Here again to my great regret, two incumbents have thought it right to resist my remonstrance.

On one question, which chiefly relates to the decline of pew rents, I must frankly express disappointment, which perhaps I ought to call displeasure. Let me be plain. Neither at this Visitation nor the last have I made any attack on the pew rent system. The Church is at present too much divided upon it: and too many of our best men, clergy and laity, favour the system. I see its advantages, not only in a financial way, but for securing a settled congregation. They are so great that it is very hard to consider fairly the question whether they outweigh the disadvantage of appearing to give a class character to our churches. But this is not the point on which I have striven to concentrate attention, the point, namely, of provision against the future in the many cases where pew rents will

fall away and leave a cypher or a few pounds where now is a reasonable income.

Let me quote two cases which came before me almost successively in revising the returns.

One suburban clergyman writes, and the record is honourable to himself, "I have tried to raise an endowment fund (which I promised not to partake of), but with small encouragement: alas! it is said, each age must provide for itself!" And then hear the man whose church was suburban a generation ago. "It is too late to make any provision for the future. . . An endowment might have been well and easily provided in the past."

The case is plain: experience decisive: the prospect undeniable. I put it as strongly as I could last time. Yet I have only found one or two cases where my words have had any practical effect. The chief argument used is in one sense unanswerable, in another open to decisive answer. "We have no more than we need for present wants." Very likely: but what will be done by those in time to come who have the same wants, but neither the rents *nor the rent-payers*? A small beginning might lead to great results. Nest eggs attract. Laymen sometimes say that they cannot deduct from the parson's income by any deduction from present rents for an Endowment Fund. I agree in many cases, though not in all, but there are other methods. The parson says that he cannot propose any plan to the laymen for fear of seeming to have a selfish object. It would not be difficult by co-operation to avoid both these difficulties, at least in many cases. I do not ask for impossibilities, but for efforts, and I address myself chiefly, though through you, to the laity. If these efforts are not made, I shall have only the poor comfort of feeling that I am not an accomplice in what I must call a callous and even cruel neglect of the interests of those who are to come. "Pew rents will see us out," or "each age must provide for itself," reported by one of you as the answer his people give, are the sayings of pure selfishness: for a generation like an individual can be selfish.

Let me bring these details to an end with a word on two subjects on which I do not use authority, but I would earnestly desire to use influence, especially with young incumbents, and those who will

soon be such. I mean the subjects of daily services, and unlocked churches. In neither case can I charge myself with driving a theory, or with a pedantry of rule. In both I have before me a clear view of the practical result which is to be desired.

First as to unlocked churches. In country places the desire to find an open church may be regarded as only a pretty bit of sentiment or a matter of tourist's convenience. But the cases would be necessarily unregistered, and their total might be considerable, where the passer-by turned in for a few moments of rest or prayer in the voiceful quietness of a silent church. The cases where churches have thus been open for many years without hurt will answer suggested difficulties.

But I think chiefly of the church in the crowded town. I think I know nothing which seems to me more pure and disastrous waste of exactly that which is most wanted, than the absence among our people who live where home prayer is almost impossible, of any use of the church in their midst. I put it to some of those young and devoted men who know so well what it is to labour with ungrudging patience at small beginnings, and for small results, whether they could not break ground here, and gradually create—perhaps first at a definite hour, and at special seasons, such as before a coming sacrament,—some habit of thus using the church without a service. It is one of yourselves, a man whose many years of the best work under hard conditions justifies his words who says: "I work, however long the work may be, to make the church of a poor parish the religious home of the poor. I am sure it can be done with time and patience." "The religious home of the poor"; should not that be exactly our ideal?

Then as to daily services. In this case I cannot deny that there is, in my judgment, in all average or ordinary cases a very plain duty, as plain as any in the whole region of rubrical obedience, which as a parish priest I should not feel able to escape, and less than ever since the language of Prayer-Book obedience has been upon every one's lips: but I do not now insist upon this. The considerations which I would urge are the wholly untechnical ones of spiritual utility. Here again the country village and the town differ: and it is of the town that I chiefly speak. I think

indeed that the country incumbent with his house within a few hundred yards of his church, who repairs there once or twice daily, "being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered," and pulling with his own hand at the appointed time a few strokes of the bell, says in the still and sacred place the morning and evening office of the day, sometimes joined by two or three, more often in many places alone, shows one of those testimonies to spiritual realities, offered in humble and consistent self-denial, which are of more value than many showier and more 'effective' bits of work. I speak of what I have seen in act, and in result. It means to his people steady consistency, where consistency brings no applause; it means an unpressed example of simple dutifulness, and a genuine belief in the power of prayer: and it means a quiet reminder, falling constantly with feather-touches on men's minds and on his own, that the parson is essentially and primarily a man of God. The psychology which rates such results as of slight importance does not seem to me a deep one: nor is it I am sure that of the Church.

But even this is not what I have most before my mind to-day. I am thinking of what is true of town parishes, and specially of those of the humbler class. You will agree with me that the first need is to form the little nucleus of devoted, single-hearted worshipping Christian people which may be a "hot centre" to the life and work of the Parish. This little company will contain several kinds: but surely one group, recruited perhaps in part from those who in any service but that of their Saviour might be accounted ineffectives or *emeriti*, will maintain round their pastor the daily intercession of the Parish. "Gathered one by one with his angle and line," and taught to see the meaning of such a practice and to love it, they will seek (can we doubt that they will win?) a blessing which is doubly and trebly promised. I feel certain that in a true science of spiritual strategy this would be reckoned as one of the humble departments upon whose services the fight at the front depends for its steadiness and its fire.¹

¹ I cannot resist the desire to quote from Mr. Morley's noble life of Mr. Gladstone the touching words in which at eighty-six, describing the limitations of old age, he refers to the habit of a life-time, and shows what it had meant to him. "I am unable to continue attendance at the daily morning service, because I may not rise

If any one feels that the Daily Offices of the Prayer-Book lack for this purpose simplicity or concreteness of local and personal detail, I wish they would ask the Rector of Woolwich how by the use of parochial intercessions after the third Collect he makes a service of just such a kind as we want. Needless to say that I should very gladly sanction any arrangement of this kind.

And then, brethren, I am brought by this detail of Daily Service to the general topic with which I would end. What if the Providence of God, of whose forbearing mercy this Church of England has had so many proofs, is even now leading us, through much that seems to be against us, though our failures and our difficulties towards the opportunity of recovering and receiving a truer conception of the Church, a conception historically more primitive, scientifically more genuine, politically more congenial to democratic days, practically more suited to the coming time. Cast a thought back to the Acts, to the germ Church of Jerusalem, to the little societies of Colossæ or Corinth: consider for a moment the essential character of a Church as a society of spiritual equals, with due and divine provision for authority and rule, but still a free society of spirit-led believers energising by common counsel, common effort, common prayer. What place, what chance, we are moved to cry, has this had yet in all the long history of Christian effort? The very type is almost lost: it hardly enters into the mind of modern men to think that this is what a Church essentially is. It could not be realised during the long mediæval period when the Church had an untrained world in tutelage, when the name of clerk was a synonym for social efficiency, when the heavy hand of Papal centralisation fell upon local liberties and paralysed self-governing institutions. Possibly if Dr. Jessopp is right in the profoundly interesting picture which he has given of English village society before the Reformation,¹ there was more to modify this than we generally see, but so in the main it was. Mark too how this governed the sequel. It before 10. And so a Hawarden practice of over fifty years is interrupted, not without some degree of hope that it may be resumed. Two evening services (in the week), one at 5 and the other at 7, afford me a limited consolation." By a coincidence the clerical instance which has, from youth up, impressed me most, thus reaches the same term of eighty-six years of age.

¹ *Before the Great Pillage*, by Augustus Jessopp, D.D. (Fisher Unwin, 1901.)

is in the power of an *ancien régime*, as De Tocqueville showed so brilliantly in the case of the change from Monarchical to Revolutionary and Imperial France, to bequeath some of its characteristic features and faults to the system which apparently destroys it. The Reformation threw off the Papal yoke, and reduced with no sparing hand the power of the priest. But it did little to reconstruct forgotten liberties and constitutional rights of the Church either in the parish, or in the diocese, or even in the nation. And so, after a century and a half of storm, we subsided into that condition of a Church with hardly a rudiment of its organic character, which lasted for another century and a half, and which governs so far more than we realise the working and tone of the Church of to-day. In the parish it was the system of parson and squire, which through uneventful days showed whole tracts of secularism and effeteness, though it also had its humble and hardy 'flora' in the faithful pastoral duties and charities of untrained and scattered individuals in country parsonages. In the diocese it meant the Lord Bishop, with his palace and his equipages and his officials, but nothing that was really diocesan at all. In the nation it meant the Church of Whig place men, and suppressed Convocations, and almost complete unconsciousness that Missionary duty was a function of Christ's Church. Dear brothers, as we think of all this, is it wonderful that we find ourselves where we do to-day in failure, in divided energies, in broken discipline, in chill and lukewarm loyalty to creed or worship? Are we not rather drawn to adapt the saying of Boccaccio's visitor to mediæval Rome: "The Church must be divine which can survive with such a capital as this."

Meanwhile the spirit of spiritual citizenship, almost stifled in the Church, found vent through the conventicle. For great stretches of time, and in many places, the characters that had in them special aptitudes for religious citizenship were picked over by the attractions of Dissent. And what we admire in the compact membership and organised life of Nonconformity to-day, or deplore in its adulterated form of political agitation, is, we cannot doubt, largely due to material which a Church more instinct with the corporate spirit might have retained under those deepening and refining influences which the

Catholic Creed and the Church's order of Sacrament and discipline alone exert. Nor did revivals in the Church at once supply this lack. They were, thank God, primarily spiritual, and they aimed straight at the most urgent needs of the conscience. Upon these the Evangelical movement spent its whole strength with austere demand for individual faith and piety. The case of the Church Movement which came later was more complex. As its name implies, it reaffirmed the essentially corporate nature of the Kingdom. We recognise evidence of this in the way in which in its early days it touched hands in this respect across chasms of difference with the teaching of F. D. Maurice in his "Kingdom of Christ," and again in its second and third generation has exchanged and blended influence with that of Westcott and the Christian Socialists. In the field of action the forces stirred which led to the revival of Convocation, and to the development of the Colonial Church under men like Selwyn. But the grievous need of repairing the breaches made by puritan and latitudinarian influences turned the force of the movement predominantly into channels of dogmatic and sacramental revival. The Church was thought of more as the authority for guarding revelation, and the depository of truth and grace, than as the living and many-functioned brotherhood working in the power of the Spirit. And the influence of the mighty stereotype of the Church of the past in the Roman Church acted like a magnet deflecting some of the delicate instruments which might have pointed to the Church of the future. Energies were and are absorbed either in restoration or in controversy which might have done nobler and yet more difficult work in construction. Some of us have not yet forgotten the impassioned eloquence with which this was set out in view of the claims of the Missionary Church for forward and developing work by that strong Churchman, Bishop Douglas of Bombay, in his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, published in 1872. And now to-day the same danger is with us, and men are timidly asking whether the Church of England is Catholic enough, or perhaps Protestant enough, instead of thankfully and boldly accepting God's gifts and grace in her, and joyfully recognising the outlines of a unique opportunity committed to her as a Church gifted with the unchanging Creed, the essentials of order, and worship, and the ministries of grace, free from much

lumber of accretion and corruption, with an open Bible, and a large freedom for reverent enquiry, a great and patient allowance for different forms of interpretation and partial opinion generated in the controversies of the past, and a wide elasticity of practical experiment. There is our opportunity as I see it: and the spirit which we need for grasping it is that of which the old English ideal of constitutional loyalty, and some of the modern ideals which touch the people most in co-operation and socialism are reflections, the spirit I mean of the Sacrament of the broken and given loaf of Living Bread, the spirit of the Lord's Prayer, of Brotherhood, of Truth working by Love in and through an organism of living stones, of spiritual unit-cells built up into the body in Christ, the spirit which is in us the very presence and work of the Holy Spirit of God.

Possibly you will see how manifold are the bearings of such an ideal. To myself its practical influence recurs at every turn. From it must be taken our type of the congregation, the only one which we can possibly commend to the citizen or the artisan; not the company who come together to get good and listen passively to the discourse of the preacher, or to attend a Sacrament which the Priest performs without common work or common responsibility: but the body which feels itself corporately God's trustee and instrument for His work, the work of good, in that place: which has its nucleus and its bond and its common strength in the common worship offered weekly by the many, daily by the few; which turns common energy upon its tasks of morality and temperance and rescue; which breeds in some of its members the true civic spirit; in which thought upon sacred things and practical efforts is exchanged freely between Ministers and hearers of the Word: which has a common care for even the fabric of the sanctuary. [Is this all fanciful? or am I reading the best traits of the best pieces of work which I see among you?

Then too would our diocesan life become wholly different in energy and skill: with a fiscal reform wrought by the liberal contributions of those who understand almsgiving as a distinct and methodical branch of Christian life, and have learnt that in the Christian Brotherhood there is still a large community of goods for the relief of great needs, and for the common execution of great tasks: with a War Office reform for the Holy War, since the whole

people understands that there must be efficient and elastic organisation, under trusted leaders commanding regulars, volunteers, and reserves, for the great battle of evangelisation and of conflict with sin and unbelief.

We are cumbered with questions of discipline, and men cry to the Bishops to pronounce more boldly or to restrain more firmly. What is the condition of their doing so? It is that they should not be dignified autocrats, pompously or peremptorily uttering their own prejudices or thoughts, but constitutional rulers, able in the parish where the priest is complained of to find out in a constitutional way the wishes, needs or grievances of the faithful: able in the administration of discipline to take counsel constitutionally with representatives of the clergy and faithful laity. May I beg you in this connection to read with care the report of a Joint Committee of both Houses of our Convocation presented by the Dean of Westminster to the Lower House at its last sessions, and there adopted?¹ It is full of promise and encouragement. I hope to consider and to have counsel about what may be done practically in this Diocese upon these lines. You differ among yourselves I know about the suggestion of parish councils: but if I see rightly as to the future we must work towards these, as fast as we can create the necessary spirit: and overcome the difficulties bravely by going through them and living them down.

So, again, in our Church life as a whole, what is the true stimulant, the true restraint, at once the steadying and the quickening force? Surely it is the full liberty for ordered exercise of the powers with which through nature and grace the Lord has endowed His Church, the gifts of wisdom in council, and of zeal and energy in action.² If for this it were necessary to pass through the national calamity of Disestablishment, and the robbery of the poor which is called Disendowment, I should feel that these must be faced. That is not yet proved. A Minister of the Crown has spoken in his place

¹ Convocation of Canterbury. "Report of Joint Committee on Strengthening the Administrative Powers of the Bishops."—*Nat. Soc.*

² Cp. these striking words of Mr. Gladstone: "Methodically to enlist the members of a community with due regard to their several capacities, in the performance of its public duties, is the way to make that community powerful and healthful, to give a firm 'seat' to its rulers, and to engender a warm and intelligent devotion in those beneath their sway." (*Life*, i. 385.)

in Parliament of the need of a measure of autonomy. An Established Church over the border set us the example of it. There is a strong drift towards the realisation of it: it took emphatic shape in the action of the Joint Sessions of the Committees of Convocation in July.¹ I should be disheartened above measure if this should fail, not from Erastian influence outside us, not from hostile Parliamentary forces, but through our own differences, or our own indifference: if it should be wrecked over questions of franchise and the like. I should be disheartened because it would mean failure at what seems to me the crucial point; failure to carry forward the line of what is I think the Church's true development towards that which it is her call to be; something which to other times it was not given to realise and which the permanent mediævalism of Rome gives no prospect of accomplishing; something which the free self-helping citizens of the modern State can welcome as the highest form of spiritual life; something in which scientific thought can recognise the likeness of the highly differentiated organism which it knows as the highest form of life: the typical Church of the future constitutionally organised with every part complete and vitalised by the 'love-of-the-brethren,' which though it be a personal grace can never come to its fulness without fashioning for itself congenial corporate life in those several buildings of which our own dear Church is surely one, and which ultimately may be built up, God knowing when and how, into the holy temple which is the habitation of God through the Spirit.

I commend to you, my Rev. Brethren, the thoughts of this Charge, with a most genuine diffidence as to my expression of them, but with a strong confidence that they have, in part at least, a value which unhappily that expression may disguise. It can be found only if the whole argument is passed carefully and reflectively through your own minds, that whatever is sterling and germinal in it may find its way with good result into our Church life while your conscience and experience sift away the alloy.

May God lead us forward, in the light of His countenance, and by the promised guidance of His Spirit, along the way that He would have us to go.

¹ *Guardian*, July 15, 1903.

APPENDICES

THE DIOCESE OF ROCHESTER

- I. ITS SIZE.
- II. ITS VOLUNTARY INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR SEVEN YEARS.
- III. ITS DEVELOPMENT.
- IV. ITS AUXILIARIES.
- V. ITS EDUCATIONAL WORK.

DIOCESE OF ROCHESTER

I.

NUMBER OF PARISHES, 352.

NUMBER OF LICENSED CLERGY,

Population of South London with 10 Metropolitan Boroughs south of the Thames :—

1891	1,525,572	
1901	1,749,566	Increase in 10 years, 223,994.

Population of the Rest of the Diocese, including the workers in and around Rochester and the Naval Dockyard of Chatham :—

1891	413,215	
1901	505,381	Increase in 10 years, 92,166.

Total Population of Diocese, 1891 ...	1,938,787	
„ „ „ 1901 ...	2,254,947	Increase in 10 years, 316,160.

II.

ROCHESTER DIOCESAN SOCIETY.

STATISTICS FOR THE SEVEN YEARS, 1896–1902.

YEAR.	Total Income from within and without the Diocese.	† Annual Subscriptions from the Diocese only.	Donations from the Diocese only.	Church Collections from the Diocese only.
1896	£11,250	£2,504	£1,449	£2,837
1897	11,217	2,501	1,425	2,662
1898	12,347	2,493	1,836	2,835
1899	*19,221	2,617	3,100	2,694
1900	14,277	2,681	1,618	2,686
1901	13,140	2,711	2,781	2,568
1902	13,671	2,704	3,000	‡2,641

* Includes Duke of Westminster's gift, £5,000.

† Ladies' Association *not* included.

‡ Seventy Churches did not have Collections.

II.—STATISTICS FOR THE SEVEN YEARS, 1896-1902 (*continued*).

YEAR.	Number of Living Agents and Amount Paid.		Grants for Objects from 1896 to 1902 inclusive.		
	No.	Amount Paid.	Object.	No. of Grants.	Amount.
1896	177	£7,322	Endowments	26	£3,500
1897	185	7,657	Sites (including costs of Conveyances) ...	39	4,427
1898	191	7,461	Permanent Churches (including Enlarge-ments, &c.)... ..	47	11,688
1899	222	8,025	Mission Buildings (including Rents) ...	101	5,758
1900	241	9,132	Parsonages	10	1,220
1901	241	9,329	Repairs to Ecclesiastical Buildings ...	17	1,102
1902	243	9,094	Church Work... ..	27	1,408

III.

LIST OF CHURCHES CONSECRATED IN THE SEVEN YEARS, 1895-1903.

S. Andrew, Limpsfield.	S. John the Divine, Balham.
S. Paul, Wimbledon.	*S. Margaret, Streatham.
All Saints, Streatham.	S. Cyprian, Brockley.
S. Alphege, Southwark.	*S. Paul, Plumstead.
All Saints, West Dulwich.	S. Peter, Clapham.
Holy Trinity, Roehampton.	S. Mark, Wimbledon.
S. Michael and All Angels, Southfields.	*S. Andrew with S. Michael, Greenwich Marsh.
All Saints, South Merstham.	*S. Bartholomew, Battersea.
*All Saints, New Eltham.	*St. Mark, Plumstead.
S. Barnabas, Clapham Common.	S. Thomas, Telford Park, Streatham.
S. Matthias, Tulse Hill.	*S. Silas, Nunhead.
S. Jude, Southwark.	

* R. D. S. Mission District.

THE FOLLOWING NEW DISTRICTS HAVE BEEN FORMED AS PEEL DISTRICTS OR AS MISSION DISTRICTS SUPPORTED BY THE ROCHESTER DIOCESAN SOCIETY, 1895-1903.

1895.	S. Margaret, Streatham	R.D.S.
1895.	S. Michael, Southfields	R.D.S.
1895.	S. Augustine, Upper Tooting	R.D.S.
1896.	United Girls' School Mission	R.D.S.
1899.	Ascension, Plumstead	R.D.S.
1899.	S. Andrew, Catford	R.D.S.
1900.	S. Hilda, Crofton Park	Peel District.
1900.	All Saints, New Eltham	R.D.S.
1900.	S. Saviour, Raynes Park	R.D.S.
1903.	Abbey Wood, Plumstead	R.D.S.
1903.	S. Michael, S. Beddington	R.D.S.

IV.

THE FOLLOWING SCHOOL AND COLLEGE MISSIONS ARE WORKING IN S. LONDON.

	<i>Began</i>
S. John's College, Cambridge (Walworth)	1884.
Charterhouse (Southwark)	1885.
Clare College, Cambridge (Rotherhithe)	1885.
Wellington College (Walworth)... ..	1885.
Trinity College, Cambridge (Camberwell)	1886.
Pembroke College, Cambridge (Walworth)	1886.
Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (Camberwell)	1887.
Caius College, Cambridge (Battersea)	1887.
Cheltenham College (Nunhead)	1890.
The United Girls' Schools (Camberwell)	1897.

THE FOLLOWING ARE GIVING SPECIAL HELP TO DIFFERENT PARISHES.

Jesus College, Cambridge.
 Queens' College, Cambridge.
 Cranleigh School.
 Bradfield College.

THE FOLLOWING ARE EXAMPLES OF SETTLEMENTS OR OTHER BODIES GIVING
 VOLUNTARY HELP TO PARISHES IN SOUTH LONDON AND ELSEWHERE.

	<i>Began</i>
The Diocesan College of Grey Ladies (Blackheath Hill) (Branches in Kennington Park Road and at Gravesend) ...	1893.
University Settlement (Southwark)... ..	1887.
Cambridge House (late Trinity Settlement, 1889)	1896.
Lady Margaret Hall Settlement (Lambeth)	1897.
United Girls' School Miss. Settlement (Camberwell)	1898.
S. Bridget's House (Wellington Mission) (Walworth)... ..	1899.
Talbot House Settlement (Camberwell)	1900.
All Saints' Church House (Battersea)	1892.
Blue Ladies, Dynevor House (Blackheath)	1895.

THE DIOCESAN ORDER OF DEACONESSSES CONSISTS OF LADIES FULLY TRAINED AND
 SET APART BY LAYING ON OF HANDS FOR MINISTERIAL WORK.

TABLE SHOWING THE DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOLARS IN THE DIOCESE OF ROCHESTER (1893) AND THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE COUNTRY.
AREA OF THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

Division.	Roman Catholic.		Wesleyan.		Other Denominations.		Board.		Church.		TOTAL.	
	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.
Greenwich ...	2,588	1,548	451	183	541	232	45,611	37,747	14,378	10,653		
Southwark ...	4,545	2,643	—	—	773	709	34,864	28,887	8,280	5,528		
E. Lambeth ...	2,351	1,313	567	445	263	169	52,167	44,908	10,010	7,734		
W. Lambeth ..	2,657	1,626	1,768	1,073	1,730	1,070	58,062	49,062	26,991	19,824		
	12,141	7,130	2,786	1,701	3,307	2,180	190,704	160,604	59,659	43,739	268,597	215,354
Kent ...	750	565	1,267	1,134	1,058	1,109	5,461	4,821	16,070	13,725		
Surrey ...	1,225	546	801	515	1,896	1,606	8,396	5,940	21,721	15,419		
	1,975	1,111	2,068	1,649	2,954	2,715	13,857	10,761	37,791	29,144	58,652	45,380
	14,116	8,241	4,861	3,350	6,261	4,895	204,561	171,365	97,450	72,883	327,249	260,734
	357,651	214,653	209,369	136,631	393,437	253,871	2,108,319	1,688,668	2,693,841	1,806,207	5,762,617	4,100,030

REMAINDER OF THE DIOCESE.

TOTAL FOR WHOLE DIOCESE.

TOTAL FOR ENGLAND AND WALES.

TABLE SHOWING THE DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOLARS IN THE DIOCESE OF ROCHESTER (1903) AND THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE COUNTRY.

AREA OF THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

Division.	Roman Catholic.		Wesleyan.		Other Denominations.		Board.		Church.		TOTAL.	
	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.	Acc.	Att.
Greenwich ...	3,268	2,028	—	—	1,248	682	65,932	52,772	13,043	9,953		
Southwark ...	4,817	2,960	—	—	542	196	40,657	31,190	8,921	6,789		
E. Lambeth ...	2,904	2,306	544	293	263	211	61,642	49,799	10,419	8,156		
W. Lambeth..	4,461	2,487	1,761	1,158	1,415	869	82,939	67,895	28,835	21,744		
	15,450	9,781	2,305	1,451	3,468	1,958	251,170	201,656	61,218	46,642	333,611	261,458
Kent ...	1,208	1,001	1,345	1,314	2,118	2,042	13,513	9,957	20,629	17,509		
Surrey ...	1,635	1,036	787	627	2,414	1,799	10,835	7,331	27,283	21,128		
	2,843	2,037	2,132	1,941	4,532	3,841	24,348	17,288	47,912	38,637	81,767	63,744
	18,293	11,818	4,437	3,392	8,000	5,799	275,518	218,944	109,130	85,279	1,151,378	325,232
	403,064	261,191	183,673	130,102	322,887	218,481	3,003,247	2,369,980	2,813,978	1,927,663	6,726,849	4,915,417

SUMMARY OF THE TWO PRECEDING TABLES

Percentage of Children of Diocese in Church Schools :

1893	27.6 per cent.
------	-----	-----	-----	-----	----------------

1903*	26.1 ,,
-------	-----	-----	-----	-----	---------

* (This is, of course, upon a *largely* increased population.)

Percentage of Scholars in Church Schools, 1903 :

In London	17 per cent.
-----------	-----	-----	-----	--------------

In Country	60 ,,
------------	-----	-----	-----	-------

Increase in Accommodation of Church Schools in the decade 1893-1903 :

In London	1,559
-----------	-----	-----	-----	-------

In Country	10,121
------------	-----	-----	-----	--------

Total	11,680
-------	----	-----	-----	--------

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED, BREAD ST. HILL, E.C., AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

332389

332389

BX
5035
F7
Frere, Walter Howard, Bp. of Truro, 1863-1938.
Lancelot Andrewes, a representative of
Anglican principles. London, Society for
Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York,
E.&J.B. Young, 1898.

28p. 22cm. (Church Historical Society
(Gt. Brit.) Publications, no.44)

Bound with Ottley, R.L. The Bible in the church.
London, 1896; Collins, W.E. The authority of general
councils. London, 1896; Collins, W.E. The teaching power
of the church. London, 1896; Collins, W.E. The rights
of a particular church in matters of practice. London,

(Continued on next card)

332389

